DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 709 UD 020 394

AUTHOR	Batson, Ruth: Peters, Lyda
TITLE	Community Crisis Intervention: A Training Manual.
INSTITUTION	Boston Univ., Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Rockville, Md. Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems.
PUB DATE	Jul 79
GRANT	NIMH-MH-27837
NOTE	144p.; Some pages may be marginally legible : Prepared in collaboration with the Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center, Boston, MA.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Attitudes; *Community Programs; *Crisis Therapy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Health Personnel; *Mental Health Programs; School Community Relationship; *School Integration

ABSTRACT

This manual is designed to help community mental health workers to intervene effectively in community crises, particularly school desegregation. The rationale for involving mental health personnel in community crises is explained. The need for expertise among such workers is emphasized, and strategies for gaining this expertise are outlined. Also discussed are ways in which crisis intervenors can work effectively with community members and with individuals in positions of power. Exercises for increasing self awareness in the areas of racial stereotyping are outlined for use among community and school groups. Means for establishing liaisons with law enforcement officials, school administrators and the mass media are suggested. The second part of the manual consists of the following readings: (1) remarks on community mental health center involvement in school desegregation, by Robert Okin, Massachusetts Commissioner of Mental Health; (2) a statement by Andrew Young; (3) "Mental Health Intervention in Community Crises," by Ruth M. Batson and Lyda S. Peters; (4) "Racism, School Integration, and Mental Health," by Sanford I. Cohen; (5) remarks by Senator George McGovern; (6) a chapter on racism from Floyd Barbour's book, "The Black Seventies"; and (7) chapters on historical and legal aspects of school desegregation from Meyer Weinberg's book, "Minority Students: A Research Appraisal." (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183709

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ruth M. Batson
Boston University

COMMUNITY CRISIS INTERVENTION

A Training Manual

by Ruth M. Batson, Ed.M.
and Lyda S. Peters, Ed.M.

Compiled and edited by

Peter Reich, M.P.H.

A publication of The School Desegregation Response Project
of Boston University School of Medicine, Division of Psychiatry
and the Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center
85 East Newton Street, Suite 806
Boston, Massachusetts 02118

July 1979

This publication was made possible by a grant from the Center for Studies of Metropolitan Problems, National Institute of Mental Health, grant number MH-27837.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

Rationale and Context.....3

Knowing Your Subject.....5

Crisis Team Building.....7

Identifying & Working with the Power Structure 15

Stereotyping.....17

Exercise I.....18

Exercise II.....20

Exercise III.....23

Liaison with Enforcement.....25

Liaison with Schools.....29

Liaison with the Media.....34

Self-Care.....45

First Aid.....47

Bibliography.....49

PART II

Remarks of Commissioner Robert Okin.....55
Remarks of Ambassador Andrew Young.....60
Remarks of Batson and Peters.....62
Remarks of Sanford I. Cohen, M.D.....75
Remarks of Senator George McGovern.....93
Remarks of Chester Pierce, M.D.....101
Historical Framework.....111
Legal Framework.....127

PART I

TRAINING FOR
COMMUNITY CRISIS

> Segregation is now so intense and so massive in most of our major metropolitan areas that there is no simple answer, no case-by-case procedure that is likely to reverse it or even to break the momentum of growing ghettos and barrios. Producing integration in the cities is likely to be every bit as difficult as the transformation of the South during the 1960's and 1970's.
>
> (From: Desegregation and the Cities - The Trends and Policy Choices, U.S. Senate Committee on Human Resources, 1977)

The 1977 Senate report quoted above is one of many strident and ominous commentaries that appear with increasing frequency as reminders that the great and ambitious dreams of the 1960's, instead of drawing closer, are receding rapidly. One authority has suggested that to achieve racial desegregation in housing alone would require four or five centuries.

The net effects of continued racism in the nation's cities are reflected in statistics about crime, unemployment, teen-age pregnancy, drug abuse, and family disruption. The manner in which these social ills eat away at the fabric of a community is probably most apparent to mental health professionals who see frustration seething in a host of chronic problems, and erupting in violence. Evidence of the interaction between mental health workers and communities is reflected in recent data from federally funded Community Mental Health Centers (CMHCs).

Data for the period 1970-1975 show that utilization of CMHC services by minorities has been increasing. Particularly interesting for mental health workers are data indicating that specific problems such as drug abuse and medically distinct "disorders" are declining as presenting problems, while "social maladjustment" and "non-specific conditions" have increased by 15%. Such diagnosis suggests that mental health workers are seeing and treating deep-seated unhappiness and frustration as well as the various behaviors that result from them.

This means that CMHCs have the potential to deal

more and more with problems of a generalized nature. While posing a challenge to develop new approaches to the specific and complex needs of all populations in urban environments, this may also be an opportunity for CMHCs to play a larger role as a community resource.

The complex array of pressures that affect urban populations, ranging from energy to education, demands continuous vigilance and ingenuity on the part of mental health and other social institutions. By being alert, responsive, and innovative, such institutions can help populations plan ahead, adjust, and cope with social change. Although this manual addresses the particular issue of school desegregation, the methods employed will equip mental health workers to intervene efficiently and effectively in a wide range of community crises.

RATIONALE AND CONTEXT

What about all those social institutions designed to deal with crises?

All too often, they are part of the problem, not part of the solution.

To a certain extent, police stations and courtrooms are social institutions designed to deal with crises. But, particularly on the issue of race, their task is one of enforcement. Often, that means that someone or some group will be coerced into different behaviors. This leads to new anxieties, new confusion, and new interpersonal conflicts.

Because of the Brown Decision in May, 1954, and subsequent rulings by courts, public schools have become another social institution transformed into a lightning rod for strong and often violent feelings. Other lightning rods are housing projects, health facilities, and recreational areas.

Mental health workers have responsibilities in both chronic conditions and in emergencies that affect the mental health of a community.

Knowing what to do in both situations is an important job involving interaction with police, school systems, federal/state/city agencies, and neighbors.

Community crisis intervention requires responsiveness in emergencies (racial violence, fires, natural disasters), and persistence in identifying and monitoring deep-seated chronic problems that often erupt as emergencies.

The materials presented here have been developed over a five-year period. Work began in 1974 in anticipation of court-ordered desegregation in Boston, and has continued through the difficult times of its implementation. The task is not over yet.

KNOWING YOUR SUBJECT

A major goal of this training is to develop an understanding of certain fairly predictable behaviors that occur at times of crisis, and to sharpen abilities in identifying certain types of emotional responses and delivering "emotional first aid."

To achieve these goals it is important to understand the many psycho-social forces at play in your community. But it is also valuable to perceive these changes in the larger political context. Familiarity with the facts that led to particular political configurations in your city will make it easier for you to act in a manner that is rational, consistent, and appropriate.

Events that occur in today's cities do not materialize out of thin air; the resentment of many years has, in all probability, been seething beneath the surface for a long time; a school desegregation order may be the final blow releasing decades of tension. For example, in Boston, we knew that Judge Garrity did not wake up one morning and suddenly decide to order busing. In fact, parents in segregated communities had been working since the 1950's to achieve equality and a balanced school system. These parents educated themselves about the dynamics of school systems and school politics, and the more they learned, the more they saw the inequities that existed. For each city and community there is a history of specific responses to various forms of racism. Knowing what the history is in your community will improve your ability to be clear and articulate in debates and discussions. This, in turn, will enhance your own confidence in the purpose and goals of the law.

In the pages that follow, numerous specific methodologies for gaining expertise are offered, but the importance of detailed knowledge about this subject can not be over-emphasized. The final arbiter in struggles involving human rights is the court system. Legislatures pass laws, but the letter of the law must often be construed and interpreted by courts. This has happened with regard to policies surrounding racism. While you need not become a lawyer, knowing how key decisions have affected developments in your community can prove very useful. Many court decisions have key words and concepts that summarize social policies. Your ability to recite a short phrase summarizing the law could make a difference in a

debate or discussion with parents or school officials. It will surely raise your own consciousness about the difference between opinions, hearsay, rumors, and what is, in fact, the law.

If you don't know your subject, how do you find out? The following pages contain a number of suggestions. For specific sources, see the bibliography section.

CRISIS TEAM BUILDING

Background

Today's health care system is changing, and the concept of community crisis intervention described in this manual is part of the change.

For most of this century, most, if not all, health care has been based on the doctrine of specific etiology. A direct result of the germ theory, this doctrine holds that problems of health can be traced to a single cause. This approach to health care came about because of the orientation of medicine toward finding miracle drugs that attack and destroy the single germ.

In recent years, however, there has been growing interest in the idea that many factors contribute to health status, particularly racism, poverty, and exposure to toxic substances (which is often related to social class and race because of the location of low-income housing). Modifying the health care system with this changing view of what affects the health of individuals is a difficult task and the polarities of opinion it creates may be seen in the debates about national health insurance.

The idea that many factors contribute to community crisis is a central part of community crisis intervention, and it obliges intervenors to look beyond the individual to the community as a whole.

Community Crisis Intervention

In thinking about intervention, most professionals start with a notion of crisis intervention that springs from the traditional therapeutic orientation.

In the traditional model, the worker reacts to the specific problem of a patient who has demonstrated a serious problem at a particular point in time, and who needs immediate help and attention. A good example is a suicidal patient who needs to be restrained to prevent harm to him/herself or others. The type of treatment deemed appropriate for someone in such a state of crisis would most likely be drug therapy to control behavior. After the crisis peaks and the

patient calms down, long-term individual or group therapy might be appropriate.

This specific, individual, therapeutic approach is vitally important; but it fails to address larger social issues that lead to suicidal tendencies and other destructive, disruptive behaviors.

Community Crisis Intervention is an approach to long term prevention as well as responsive intervention with groups of individuals and communities. The following chart depicts some of the differences between the two approaches.

Traditional Crisis Intervention	Community Crisis Intervention
Emergency based, short-term, symptom reducing	Long-term, programmatic response (with elements of on-the-spot intervention)
Treatment of individual patient and his/her crisis as it stems from intrapsychic or external cause (fire, loss)	Treats external causes within the environment and societal pressures that affect community systems (and residents)
Symptoms often clear and treatable: drug overdose; suicide attempt; lack of food, clothing, shelter, empathy	Development of strategies for community-based and community-organized prevention

A good--and traditionally American--example of Community Crisis Intervention occurs when communities respond to natural disasters. The spirit of cooperation, mutual support, and prevention (stockpiling sandbags) is a phenomenon often linked to the frontier spirit. However, crisis intervention often fails to address issues of racism, poverty, malnutrition, unemployment, housing and governmental policies that contribute to crises (for example, policies about location of, standards for, and inspection of hydroelectric dams in rural areas; noisy unsanitary, pollutant emitting factories in urban areas; and allocation of fuel).

Building teams to play active roles in times of crisis

involves training in unusual kinds of sensitivity. The different types of roles teams can play will be described later. In thinking about the dynamics of one group of people planning tactics with regard to other groups, a certain amount of self-consciousness is necessary. For example, in most groups, leaders often emerge, precipitating power struggles and mini-crises. As your teams come together, keep in mind that certain people fall into natural roles: leaders, anticipators, recorders. As you become aware of such developments, bring them out and discuss them before they cause a crisis in the crisis team.

To keep teams on track, it is useful to keep three goals in mind:

1. Education, with an eye toward giving youth a sense of perspective of their role in an important social movement.

2. Referral, of children and their families to appropriate resources in their community.

3. Liaison with school administrators, students, parents, police and service agencies.

The ability of crisis teams and individuals in these teams to engage in appropriate roles also requires an understanding of different types of presence at events. In order to achieve the goals of education, referral, and liaison it may be necessary for people to put aside personal feelings about desegregation and busing in order to play an objective, facilitative role. The common ground for community crisis intervention is peaceful and orderly implementation. Regardless of one's personal views, the key to successful teamwork is a commitment to the safety and protection of the children. This firm commitment to non-violence in the context of the schools is essential and must be clarified early.

A useful exercise for training involves defining and discussing the differences between roles as <u>observers</u> and <u>intervenors</u>. Familiarity with the differences between the two roles will help crisis teams develop consciousness about roles and responsibilities in different situations.

OBSERVATION

Observation involves

1. Identifying your own strong feelings pro and con about participants in any event, and ways in which these feelings could interfere with your ability to record events objectively.

2. Learning to take notes, written as well as mental, about complex and often rapidly occurring events.

3. Developing skills in noticing details: the order in which events occur, who leaders are, wnat actions trigger verbal or physical violence. The five "W's" are helpful in this process:

Who: Names, physical features, other identifying characteristics.

What: What happened? In what order?

When: Note the time. Should the police be called in, time could be critical information.

Where: This is equally important. Street names, easily identifiable and recognizable landmarks ought to be recorded.

Why: What events precipitated an incident? Was there name-calling, hitting, drinking?

Basically, observation in its strictest sense and in this context, describes the process of monitoring activity of all participants including law enforcers with respect to the treatment of children. Because official proceedings could result from such monitored activity, objectivity is of the utmost importance. For people who will engage in observation, self-examination is essential.

INTERVENTION

Intervenors become involved in action in several ways.

One of the most important roles for the intervenor is to act as a supportive person to children who are arrested in unfamiliar and hostile areas. Visibility and access are important so that intervenors can act

as surrogate parents in case of arraignment. Also, intervenors communicate with parents and agencies about status of children. This is especailly helpful in cases where parents are unable to get to station houses.

Intervenors also carry pre-printed forms with basic information to assist attorneys as well as telephone numbers for reaching attorneys. This helps assure that a lawyer can arrive at the courthouse before a child is arraigned. In addition, intervenors can play important roles in relations with police. This will be discussed in more detail in a section devoted to liaison with enforcement.

Finally, the single most important role of the intervenor is in the schools, acting as a human thermometer, evaluating moods, tension, and activity, then acting to maintain order. For example, in Boston, on the first day of school busing, one intervenor saw a white girl and a black girl confront each other: both screamed, a crowd of students began to gather. The intervenor went to the black girl, and put an arm around her, spoke to her gently, and was able to defuse a potentially explosive situation.

While many mini-crisis situations are the result of personal animosities and grudges, a good portion are the result of tension in general. A calm voice, a reassuring smile, a hand on the shoulder at the right time can do much to reduce the level of tension. Knowing <u>when</u> to act and acting with assuredness is an essential part of intervention.

Both observation and intervention can become more effective if you keep a log of ongoing events. This could be a brief diary or a larger scrap book with newsclippings. Whatever form it takes, it can be useful for building awareness of factors that impinge on community health and well-being. For example, the recent concern about the film <u>Warriors</u> demonstrates how external factors appear to have dramatic impacts on racially related unrest. The degree to which television and cinematic violence influences behavior is widely debated. Persons and parties protective of children argue that what is seen on screens has a very real impact on children.

One way to test this notion is to keep (or suggest that local university students in law, sociology, or political science keep) records of films and TV pro-

grams shown in your area, and compare outbreaks of violence with such programming. Other events such as motor vehicle races could also be a part of this record, as could policies on food stamps, abortion, public transportation, housing, and morbidity and mortality rates.

Discussion topic: What is the difference between intervention and observation? Are they mutually exclusive? Can one do both at the same time?

RECRUITMENT, SELECTION, AND TRAINING

1. Candidates for training in community crisis intervention should represent target communities, and should be drawn from minority and health professional communities. The experience in Boston suggests that participants signed up because of a belief in the right of people to attend schools of their choosing. These individuals also knew there would be trouble, and wanted to do "something"; the training provided a vehicle for them to do it. In Boston, we also found it necessary to draw on representatives from community agencies, churches, mental health centers, multi-service centers, and similar service groups.

2. Training. Each community has a number of resources that can be used to tailor the training to the particular needs of its population. The training, based largely on materials in this manual, was intense and serious. "Experts" in school desegregation, social workers with specialized skills, administrators familiar with procedural questions, and even a student who experienced Phase I of desegregation were all helpful in the Boston program.

3. Selection. A certain number of trainees weeded themselves out during the course of the training as it became clear what the mission was, and as three basic goals were articulated:

   i. To implement the law, not to debate pros and cons.

   ii. To assist in peaceful and orderly implementation by supporting students and their families.

   iii. To assure the safety and protection of school children by following a course of non-violence

throughout the process.

Those who felt uneasy with these three goals left the program or found other roles that would not place them in a potentially explosive situation, such as manning telephones or rumor control.

4. Placement. With distinct roles for team members on the streets, in police stations, and at the schools (also riding the busses), matching people's abilities with the potential demands of each situation is an important part of team building. For example, persons assigned to police stations ought to be from backgrounds that will not be threatening to police officers. In Boston, clergy worked in Charlestown, while white social workers were placed in the South Boston police station. For the schools, persons with whom students could easily identify were selected, while those more familiar with the streets and local hangouts worked the streets.

Finally, it is always helpful if team members possess certain qualities that may not be teachable, such as the ability to work under pressure without day-to-day supervision, and plain old ordinary ingenuity. In Boston, a crisis team member entered a school with the children, and was asked to leave by the school principal. The team member explained that the buses had departed and he was stuck in the middle of the white section of town. In the course of the day he proved himself so helpful that the principal asked him back! The ability to persuade, cajole, anticipate needs, and win people over is an invaluable quality for a crisis team member.

IDENTIFYING AND WORKING WITH THE POWER STRUCTURE

Community development professionals know that the first step in organization is to identify the power structure. "Power structure" is a term applied to the actual leadership of a community, leaders who may not necessarily hold high office, but who wield extraordinary power by virtue of influence, wealth, and control of resources.

Part of your job is to know who constitutes the power structure in your community, and how they operate. Have these people influence over particular political organizations, state/local agency administrators? What will be their response to court orders on racial issues? Who owns and manages radio and television stations, newspapers? What is their track record on coverage of race-related issues? Asking these questions and developing the clout to get answers is part of continuing community awareness.

How is it possible to develop influence and make the power structure listen and respond? CREATE YOUR OWN POWER STRUCTURE.

Creating a group of key community people involved in education, politics, health, religion and other community focal points is an effective way to focus strong community feelings onto an alternative vehicle for power.

Some specific tasks for such a group include:

- Drawing up a list, chart, or other depiction of the state and local power structure. Include names, addresses, phone numbers, and affiliations. Such a chart might also include names of schools in their communities.

- Preparing a time line: an actual chart on a long piece of paper recounting your city's involvement in racial issues. For example, were any local attorneys involved in amicus curiae briefs for key court decisions; did local contingents participate in the August 1963 March on Washington? Such a chart should include every incident and activity that will lend credibility to the notion

that a long, historic process is involved. The more information included, the better. The task of maintaining and updating this chart could be a job for a school social studies class.

- Developing a strategy: It is important to sort out the important problems and to develop an internal administrative structure to address them. For example, certain events may require a task force, while subcommittees would be appropriate for letters-to-the-editor, legislation review, or any number of issues. Be it suspensions, busing, or recreation areas, sticking with core issues will preserve unanimity within and present a unified front without. It may involve assessing how much voter power can be influenced by this newly created group, or developing a publicity strategy. Whatever the strategy, this group must delineate clear objectives.

In Boston, this group was called the Coordinated Social Service Group which was organized by the Freedom House Coalition. Composed of representatives from about 40 social service agencies, this group met to pool and coordinate the many services involved in the reaction to desegregation. The Coordinated Social Service Group met every Wednesday at Freedom House, Incorporated, in Roxbury to review recent events and discuss strategies. It became a well-known event, attended by attorneys, public officials, educators, parents, health professionals, and others involved in the court decision who wanted to know what was happening and who wanted leadership. The group issued regular reports on the courts, truancy, busing, safety and security, and drugs and alcohol. It also took a leadership role in rumor control and media relations, such as rebutting TV, radio, and newspaper stories and editorials.

Providing a forum and a focus for the many different agencies, offices, and individuals involved in the response to desegregation orders was one of the most important steps in working with the existing power structure. Power listens to power, and the key words are organization and communication.

STEREOTYPING

Self-awareness about the stereotypes we carry with us is an important first step in tuning up the psyche for crisis intervention. The invisible mental eyeglasses that we all wear can hamper our perception of events, interfere with our ability to judge objectively, and perpetuate misunderstanding.

Such stereotypes can also aggravate conflict. For example, one person working in the Boston schools during the period following court-ordered desegregation always grabbed a black youth when intervening in fights. At that particular school, black students hated this individual because they knew that blacks would always be blamed for any incident. By the same token, this person was seen as an ally by white students. Soon, he had no credibility whatsoever as an intervenor. Finally, when confronted, he acknowledged that he believed, deep down, that "black kids start fights."

Another example of potentially harmful stereotypes we carry with us are protective feelings about minorities. This is a feeling demonstrated by whites and blacks alike. At its very core, it says, "Blacks are unable to take care of themselves," or "This person can't handle him/herself." Such a patronizing attitude really says, "You are not equal to the task," and perpetuates discriminatory behavior.

One way to address the problem of stereotypes is through exercises which sensitize individuals to the subtle ways in which individual stereotypes lead to negative associations and behaviors which interfere with rational and productive intervention.

As we progress through the training, it will be helpful to remember that liking or not liking busing (or other measures) is not the issue: The issue is how to help the people whose lives are affected by reactions to court orders and other decisions affecting race relations. The stereotyping exercises are important ways of identifying individuals whose deeply rooted attitudes may render them unsuitable for certain types of confrontation activity.

EXERCISE I: GROUP SELF-IDENTIFICATION

Unlike forms of training that require individual attention before entering group process, planning and training for community crisis intervention starts with the group. These exercises may evoke feelings of hostility, fear, anxiety and frustration. Familiarity with feelings that are usually held back is part of the basic training in crisis intervention. Learning how these feelings play tricks on us establishes a kinship among team members, builds awareness about unconscious behaviors, and develops new ways of seeing problems. Group activities also serve to help participants become acquainted, relax, and perceive the subject in a similar setting. For trainers, it is a way to learn about the group and its particular sensitivities.

Ask participants to write three sentences on a piece of paper in response to the following questions (one sentence per question).

1. What type of work do you do?

2. What was the most important event in your life?

3. What do you think about desegregation?

Then, participants should be asked to read the three sentences aloud. This provides a brief, contextual story about each participant and serves to familiarize trainees with one another. Instructors should keep their ears open for unusual "stories" or those that catch the interest of others for possible future reference. Your ability as an instructor to note key words or phrases and to re-introduce them appropriately will contribute greately to thematic unity of all exercises. Depending upon your own experiences, look for ideas that you can use to shoehorn the exercise into a discussion about social change.

For example, some people, in response to the third question, will cite "tax rates will go up" or "quality of teaching in the receiving school will go down" or "the real estate situation is going to change". A discussion point might be: such changes will and do occur anyway, all the time. How much do

we use these ideas as shields against our own emotional involvement of our families, our children? What do we do about it?

Instructors need to be aware of pro-con intergroup arguments, and keep tabs on unifying threads that can be used to wrap up and pull the group together. Everybody will say they came to improve their work and understanding of desegregation, but in each group, defensive shields (such as real estate values, quality of teaching) will be erected to protect real feelings about vulnerabilities about families and children. The best way to build confidence and to pull parents and families and communities together is by creating awareness of the attitudinal obstacles to success.

EXERCISE II: PERSONAL PREJUDICE

Ask participants to share some of their personal prejudices or stereotypes, and list them on the blackboard. Each topic should include not simply a specific type of person or population, but attributes associated with them as well.

After a few minutes, the blackboard might look like this:

Politicians are crooks

Northerners are pointy-headed liberals

Southerners are dull-witted hayseeds

Jews are materialistic

Eastern Europeans are short and greasy

Blacks reduce property values

The instructor, moving rapidly to elicit comments by free association should then guide the discussion to more subtle stereotypes:

Elderly are frail and weak

Physically disabled are mentally handicapped

Stutterers are stupid

Cancer is contagious

Discussion Questions:

Where do these prejudices come from?

To an extent, prejudice is rejection of behavior or attributes considered deviant: Where do notions of perfection originate?

How can we test the validity of a prejudice or stereotype? What is the relationship between, say, a stutter and intelligence?

What are some examples of abused information?

How does the transition occur from one Mexican asleep on a doorstep or a fine tradition of siestas to "Mexicans are lazy?"

It is helpful to point out that certain stereotypes have identifiable sources; pointing these out may help in challenging stereotypic validity.

- Passenger lists from boatloads of immigrants in the late 19th century were distributed to public health authorities in rural areas. This practice was intended to alert outlying communities about possible disease carriers, but since most of the names were multisyllabic, Italian or Germanic, the long term effect was to re-inforce (or establish) the notion that "foreigners" were dirty disease carriers.

- Jews in medieval Europe were not allowed to own property; money-lending was one of the few means of survival open to them.

- Recent research conducted by the Center for Survey Research in Boston suggests that health status of the elderly may be better than is commonly believed; the notion of frail elders may have been inflated to assure provision of certain social services.

- In the early part of this century, pellagra occurred in epidemic proportions in the South. Although it is now known to be the result of a vitamin deficiency, for years it was believed to be an infectious disease in white people with "genetically inferior blood". Widespread misunderstanding about this nutritional problem contributed a great deal to prejudices towards southerners.

- Instructors should use the above examples to introduce a discussion of prejudice against blacks. Participants should be encouraged to come up with similar explanations. For example: with regard to real estate values, services are often cut back when blacks move into a building or neighborhood, making it <u>appear</u> as if their presence, rather than the reaction to their presence "causes" the deterioration in services and, eventually, land values.

Generally, such a discussion will not lead to simple explanations. The reason? Treatment of black Americans differs from racism in general in that from legal, social, economic, and political perspectives, there has been no similar example of such pervasive exploitation and oppression in western civilization.

EXERCISE III: WORD ASSOCIATION

This exercise is useful in demonstrating the degree to which cultural stereotypes may be absorbed into mental sets about home communities, and is particularly useful with younger groups. The sociological concept at play here is that of "putative identity", in which one's associations with a person or a place interfere with any other perception of it (such as a true perception).

The instructor asks the class to say the first word or words that come to mind when the name of certain communities is mentioned. The community names should include prosperous, wealthy, racially distinct, and low-income areas:

In Boston: Roxbury, Newton, South Boston

In Los Angeles: Beverly Hills, Watts

In Cleveland: Hough, Shaker Heights

Typical listings on the blackboard might be:

"poverty" "crime" "survival" for low-income communities

"wealth" "yards" "money" for high-income communities

Instructors may capitalize on the absence of, or tardiness in delivery, of terms such as:

home security family warmth

Like the stereotyping exercise, this will sooner or later swing around to pride. Instructors need to watch for changes in the mood of the group; it is almost like watching a school of fish change direction. Listen for subtle changes in defensiveness, positive direction, and build on the positive to show the group ways in which one comes to believe the negative aspects of the attributed identity.

LIAISON WITH ENFORCEMENT

Police are the enforcing arm of the law, carrying out the mandate of courts. First to arrive, first to intervene, police officers are armed, uniformed intervenors. For these reasons, they often look askance at un-uniformed, unauthorized mental health workers, regarding them as excess baggage, a nuisance they don't need.

Thus, liaison with enforcement--clear and established channels of communication between enforcement officials and crisis intervention teams--can make a vast difference in the success of desegregation efforts.

The process of establishing and maintaining relations with law enforcement officials and agencies is the Socio-Legal Component of crisis intervention, developed in Boston by the Freedom House Institute.

The goals of the Socio-Legal Component are quite specific:

- Documenting incidents as objective observers.
- Providing support for students involved in arrest proceedings.
- Informing parents about charges brought against a child.
- Apprising families and students of their legal rights.
- Supplying names and telephone numbers of lawyers.
- Negotiating with police for the release of students into parents' custody.
- Follow-up, making sure parent and child attend hearings.

Achieving these goals requires gaining entry to police stations as well as training persons to ride busses, walk the school corridors, and observe police activities.

When arrests are made, the crisis team member immediately calls a telephone number at a central coordinating desk to report the following:

- what had transpired
- name of the student involved
- how the incident started
- other people involved
- name and/or badge number of the arresting officer
- police station where the person would be taken

The following example of a legal report form illustrates with a specific example how members of the crisis team operate.

SCHOOL CRISIS LOG

Team Worker: Janice Higginbotham Date: October 1, 1975

Time Started: 9:00 a.m. Time Ended: 3:30 p.m.

Location: (circle) 1. On Bus 2. On Street 3. In School
4. Socio-Legal 5. Other

General atmosphere at site of assignment (use your own words, such as): calm, excited, natural, strained, businesslike, disrupted, friendly, hostile, etc.

Supporting Evidence: Most of the day was quite calm and friendly -- "more rapport." At 1:30 p.m. 2 state police, one black and one white, brought in a black youth who had been arrested at South Boston High. The station became very quiet & businesslike the moment the youth was brought in.

Incidents: Mention each incident briefly giving salient facts, especially who did what to whom, how many involved, with what result? Be sure to list behavior that was helpful, supportive, calming, kindly, constructive, etc., as well as that which was harmful, provoking, unfeeling, unkind, destructive, violent, etc.

Brian Johnston, a 16-year-old sophomore, was arrested for Assault and Battery, Destruction of Property and Disorderly Conduct. He was handcuffed and obviously upset though not loud or unruly. He was complaining to the black policeman that he had been mistreated by the state policeman who grabbed him and twisted his arm at school. He was taken to a back room and his possessions were taken. The state police filled out the complaint and turned him over to the sergeant at the desk (Fred whom we had fortunately "made friends" with). We were given details of the arrest and then Mrs. Johnston was called and was quite upset. Carol spoke to her on the phone, then to Freedom House and the Crisis Team. Because arraignment would not be until the next Monday, Brian could be released to his mother's custody. While Carol took care of the phone arrangements, I spoke to Brian whom they permitted to sit uncuffed behind the desk.

Any interventions of yours as team member? What did you do? What were the results?

I feel it was quite helpful to Brian to have someone to talk to at that time. He gave me his story and clearly saw me as an ally. By the time his mother arrived at 2:30 p.m., he was much calmer and even said this was the best police station he had been in (I shared that with the sergeant)

Usefulness of crisis intervention training. Was it useful in any specific situation? How?

The training definitely helped me be aware of both responsibilities--to the youth -- and also to maintain good relations with the police.

Did any situation arise in which more of different training might have helped? Say what and how.

Training was quite adequate for this situation

OTHER REMARKS: *On the whole, Brian received good treatment. I felt our presence was a definite plus. It was very helpful to have two people present. It was more efficient and Brian's needs could be attended to immediately. A few of the police hovered around while I was talking to Brian--one even asked if I was angry with him. I assured him all was well. Mutual cooperation clearly was present. We stayed after Brian left with his mother and talked to the police.*

LIAISON WITH SCHOOLS

- Working with the Schools

When you arrive at the school, report to the school office, and work with the students until they start classes for the day. If you don't already know the principal, be sure to introduce yourself. During the day try to get to know the layout of the building, and as many of the teachers and teacher-aides as you can. Look for people whom you may be able to work with in case of crisis. Try to develop rapport with as many people in the school as possible. Find out such things as: in case of trouble, what is the school's safety plan? what is the day's routine? Report from the school regularly, good news as well as bad. Parents want to know that things are going well when they are.

- Working with the Police

It is particularly important for the crisis team members to identify themselves to the police on the scene and to get to know them individually as time allows. As a member of the community you may often be able to spot potential situations before they do, and you want them to be willing to listen to you and to take your advice about dealing with the situations.

Take time to talk with them, identify yourself, explain the crisis team function, give them a flyer. If you are at the schools you may see the same individuals over and over; it helps if they know you and you know them.

- Working with the Students

Crisis team members should remember that the students are the real heroes of the desegregation process. They will ride the busses and be in the schools every day of the week, while they attempt to get an education.

Adults who are coming into the school situation should treat them with respect.

Don't talk down to them. If you want students to do something or to stop doing something, try to do so in a way that doesn't put them down in the eyes of their peers. Try to ignore things that you may not approve of but which are secondary to the process of school desegregation. If you have to make a request of students which you believe may be viewed in a negative way, try to do so privately. For example, if you have reason to believe that a student is carrying a weapon and you want him/her to give it up, try to take him/her aside privately to talk about it.

Always be sure to identify yourself to students. Explain who you are and what you are doing there. The crisis team will have a flyer prepared for students; give out copies if students seem at all interested. And remember that most students will come in contact with many adults during the course of the day. There is no reason why they should remember your name. If you want a student to remember your name or you want to talk to him/her again, write your name on the flyer for him/her.

- Working with Parents

Parents too, have to bear the brunt of the desegregation procedure on a day-to-day basis. They not only need to know what is going on each day, but in many situations they must give their consent. Be sure to identify yourself to parents and let them know what we are trying to do. Whenever possible, give parents a copy of the crisis team flyer. Like the students, the parents will be dealing with many people and cannot be expected to remember individual names. Write your name on the flyer if you can, and if parents want more information urge them to call or come to the crisis center.

- Bilingual Parents and Students

Often when people are upset, frightened or angry, they lose command of a second language. This means that bilingual students and parents may face special problems during crisis periods during the opening of school. Most of the bilingual groups (Hispanic, Haitian, Chinese, etc.) have organized to provide help during the crisis. Bilingual persons will be available to help. But in the event that you are

present in a situation where you feel a bilingual person is needed, be sure to report that fact. The "crisis manual" should list persons and/or places to call where help may be available. If possible, get the bilingual person to a telephone, so s/he can speak immediately to someone who can tell him/her what is going on. And be sure to provide him with a flyer about the crisis team with your name. Unfamiliar names are especially difficult for all of us to deal with.

- Role of the Crisis Team Member

The crisis team member is on the scene to help achieve peaceful implementation of the desegregation of the public schools. S/he will do everything possible to bring that about, especially aborting any action or crisis situation that may hinder implementation of the order.

The crisis team member should keep active in the process even (in fact, especially) when no crisis is going on. A lull offers a good opportunity to become acquainted with the other people on the scene, talk to students, parents, etc. Move around and introduce yourself to other people; use the time to get to know names and faces and to let them know you. Not talking adds to the edginess of the situation. Be aggressive about it. Say something like: "My name is _____, what's yours?" Most people will give their name more readily when they know yours. Most of the people on the scene will be legitimately there, but if you are suspicious, report what you see as soon as possible to the proper officials.

The crisis team members can do more than prevent crisis. They can recruit students, parents, and members of the community to join the process of peaceful implementation of the school desegregation order. Spend your time talking about what you're doing, and why. Help others understand the process. Sometimes when things get tense, it's hard to remember.

- Riding the Busses

As you get on the bus, note the name of the bus company and the number of the bus--usually found

near the entrance door. If you have time, find out the name of the driver. Keep windows closed and at the first sign of trouble get students to the floor, under the seats. When students are waiting on the bus, or if the situation is tense but not actually dangerous, do what you can to help students relax. Cards, singing, music, all may help. If students want to smoke, this isn't the time to argue with them about it. If a student is behaving in a way you feel may endanger his/her safety, talk to him/her directly, and if possible without putting them down in front of their friends. For example, if you see that a group of students, or a student is using drugs on the bus, in the school or within the general area of the schools, you should inform him/her that they are setting themselves up as easy marks for arrest by police followed by court action. You may also inform the drug user(s), as privately as possible, that they might even be jeopardizing the safety of their peers by causing unnecessary conflicts with the police.

If busses arrive at their destination safely and without incident, be sure to report it.

If there is a problem, report that as accurately as possible. Indicated below are two examples:

Poor Example: "We were coming back from school and some people started throwing rocks at us."

Good Example: "We were coming back from School No. ___ (or name). When we were on _____ Street in front of the supermarket on the left hand side of the street, we were stoned by four men. No one on the bus was hurt."

The identification of the bus, location of the incident, and safety report are the IMPORTANT differences here.

Try to know where you are at all times when on the bus, so you can anticipate trouble spots. Know the bus route, as well as the driver of the bus.

The crisis team bus riders will be ensuring the safety of the students while on the bus and while entering schools. They will be providing emotional

support to the students; intervention during periods of stress and crisis; educating students in self-protective measures, and what the crisis teams and desegregation is all about.

Crisis team bus riders will document any incident that may occur during any school day and report all relevant information to the central office. They will recruit parents and students to work with them toward a peaceful implmentation of the desegregation order.

LIAISON WITH THE MEDIA

How often have you heard the expression, "I read it in the paper" or "I saw it on TV"?

The truth is that most of us pick up a good portion of our conversational and background information for day-to-day activities from newspapers, television, radio and magazines.

The news media play a strange role during times of community crisis. They can be responsive and compassionate in stirring up support and presenting facts. But, conversely, the wrong reporter or news team at the wrong place at the wrong time can grossly distort events.

This section deals with understanding some of the subtle ways that news media communicate important information, and developing a strategy for responding tc media reporting that could adversly affect goals of community crisis intervention.

A good example of mixed messages came during the last presidential race, when a Boston TV station announced the endorsement of the Boston Globe. The print, visible on the screen behind the announcer, said "Globe endorsement"; the photograph, beneath the print, was of President Ford.

The candidate who won the Globe endorsement, as announced verbally, was Jimmy Carter. The combination of images, sound and print can lead to misinterpretation by viewers. Researchers know that television viewers often exert very little concentration; that messages can be extremely ambiguous, and that the rapid succession of words and images can clutter the mind. Interestingly, the most lucid, to-the-point television information is often packed into 15- or 30-second commercials.

For an illustration of how newspapers can communicate in subtle ways, especially about racial issues, turn the page.

The Washington Post STYLE People / Entertainment

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1977

The First

37

By Douglas Chevalier—The Washington

38

What are the people in this line doing?

Read the signs. Do they give you any clue as to why they are standing in line?

The Washington Post STYLE People / Entertainment

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1977

The First

It's the Day the Checks Come, And Then a Special World Opens

40

By Douglas Chevalier—The Washington Post

41

Does the addition of a second headline provide any additional information?

Does this change your idea about what the picture is about?

To a person scanning headlines, what message does this combination of print and image give?

The Washington Post STYLE People / Entertainment

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1977

The First

It's the Day the Checks Come, And Then a Special World Opens

People wait to buy food stamps outside a 14th Street credit union.

By Douglas Chevalier—The Washington Post

Copyright The Washington Post
Reprinted by Permission

This is the picture story in its entirety. Does this change your understanding of the photograph?

If your first impression is different from this third view of the picture, what do you think the major impact of this layout would be on people of different races?

How could the photograph have been presented differently?

Summary

The first picture showed a group of black people, mostly women, standing in line. The picture was obviously taken in a black community, and placement of the photograph on the "style" and "entertainment" page, gives the impression that people are lined up for admission to a night club or liquor store. This impression is reinforced by the large headline proclaiming "THE FIRST." Since "the first" is associated with pay day, perhaps the people are lining up to cash their checks in order to buy liquor and have fun.

Such an impression is verified by the second portrayal: "It's the day the checks come, and then a special world opens up." But only when one reads the small print does it become clear that the people are lining up to buy food stamps.

Would the picture have artistic merit on its own? What type of response to the newspaper editor would be appropriate?

Because ambiguous, confusing and misleading messages can sometimes get through the media screen, it is important for members of crisis teams to agree before problems occur, on some basic information policies. In this way, if one of the team is interviewed or has an opportunity to communicate with the media, comments will be precise, to the point, and representative of agreed upon policies and goals.

Some guidelines for assuring a united and consistent front:

1. Spend time together verbalizing your team goals and identifying obstacles to achieving them, so team members will share a common vocabulary.

2. Learn--and if necessary memorize--some of the key phrases in court decisions such as "every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation," or the U.S. Supreme Court's observation

that "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." In addition, it would help to identify an historic event or personage in your community or state who said or did something significant that could be tied to the present situation.

3. One excellent way to deal with media presence at an event is to know the reporters. Reporters are often as eager to have community contacts as you might be to have access to a reporter. How to get acquainted? By calling the city desk of a local news organization to learn who has the education, court, or community beat. Clip articles by one or two reporters whose work you think is good; praise them when they're good, and correct mistakes (a call or postcard will do the trick). In this way, at a time of crisis, you'll be in a position to approach them and give your version and comments.

SELF-CARE

If you are reading this, you probably know what "burn-out" means. But that doesn't mean you can prevent it.

You are only as effective as your own mental and physical health lets you be. If you are working in a tense situation, especially over a long period of time, you run the risk of becoming irritable, depressed, and part of the problem.

Early on, establish with your co-workers a protocol for helping each other identify symptoms of burn-out in the following categories:

- Thinking: Confusion, slowness of thought, difficulty in judging or deciding, difficulty in assigning priorities.
- Feeling: Depression, irritability, anxiety, overexcitability, low threshold for frustration, extreme mood swings.
- Physical Ailments: Physical exhaustion, loss of energy, stomach problems, appetite changes, hypochondria, sleep disorders, etc.
- Behavior: Overactivity, restlessness, excessive fatigue, withdrawal.

In addition, discuss and identify ways to help yourself relieve tension such as:

- simple exercises
- time to be alone and tend to yourself
- keep notes on what you do and how you feel

Burn-out is a reality, especially when you are working in highly sensitive areas such as reactions to desegregation. If tensions are particularly high, an entire team can become fatigued, and burned out. Team members should agree early on, on mechanisms for taking time out to meet and de-brief. At these meetings, team members can discuss support services needed for

each other, and arrange coverage to assure that members have time to attend to personal matters.

In a sense, the observation and intervention technique applied in schools, streets, and police stations will come to play among the team members. To a considerable extent, being able to be honest and straightforward in this context will be a test of responsiveness to external demands.

Some ways to minimize burdens on the group as a whole include:

- agreeing on regular meeting and de-briefing times.
- changing placements or schedules to provide more personal time to people who may need it.
- agreeing on "pressure-release valves" such as mental health days, or time-out plans, so there is a built in mechanism for dealing with individual burn-out before it becomes contagious.
- thinking of ways to do something for the group: go out to dinner, bring curtains or plants into a central office. Post good news, especially about events facilitated by crisis team members.

Giving an identity to the team, by having regular meetings or engaging in structured, periodic training sessions, is a way of assuring on-going self-monitoring.

FIRST AID

If an accident or injury occurs during a crisis, crisis team members should know some basic first aid, and should take initiative to maintain calm and call for help if necessary.

A good resource for emergency care is Emergency Care and Transportation of the Sick and Injured, published by the Committee on Allied Health, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, 430 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 60611. Depending on the skills and determination of need, it might be wise to have a medical team offer a brief first aid/emergency care training session to the team.

Some Basic Guidelines

1. Cuts and Wounds:

    a. Stop the bleeding by applying direct pressure and clean the wound.

    b. Keep the person warm.

    c. Clear the airway to facilitate breathing.

2. Chemical Burns/Burns

    a. Remove burned clothing, and make sure no smoldering fabric remains.

    b. Cover the burned area with ice bags or cold water. For chemical burns, wash with rapidly flowing water, especially if eyes are affected.

    c. Make sure the person has fresh air.

    d. Have the person lie down.

3. Fainting

    a. Loosen tight clothing.

    b. Have the person lie flat, feet slightly elevated.

    c. Do not give anything by mouth.

4. Kicks in the Stomach

   a. Do not give liquids.

   b. Have the person lie down.

   c. Make sure there is plenty of fresh air.

5. Gunshot Wounds

   a. Generally, follow procedures from (1).

   b. If wound is in abdomen or chest, <u>tightly</u> cover the wound, have person lie down.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographies on racism, desegregation, and minority education abound. Rather than present an exhaustive list of titles, the editors of this manual decided to present a few select titles, and detailed information about how to find specific information according to particular needs.

For the purpose of putting together this manual, we relied on the following for specific supportive information.

Bibliography on Racism, DHEW Publication #ADM 76-318 (Formerly HSM 73-9102), reprinted in 1976.

Batson, Ruth and Lyda Peters, "Community Crisis Intervention and the Boston Desegregation Effort," Case Study of a Training Program, published by the Crisis Intervention Program, Division of Psychiatry, Boston University School of Medicine/ Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center, Boston, MA, 1976. Available through ERIC Document.

Boston University Division of Psychiatry, "School Desegregation: The Role of the Community Mental Health Center," Conference Report, November 7-10, 1976. Available through ERIC Document.

Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, U.S. Public Health Service, "Training Manual for Human Service Workers in Major Disasters," USDHEW Pub. No. (ADM) 77-538, 1978. U.S. Government Printing Office Stock No. 017-024-00685-8. This training manual was developed for use in dealing with major disasters. While the orientation is toward natural disasters, such as floods, hurricanes, etc., the vocabulary and methods for dealing with emotional responses are applicable to racial issues.

McKee, Richard K., Crisis Intervention in the Community, University Park Press, Baltimore, 1974.

National Institute of Education, USDHEW, A Fieldwork Manual for Studying Desegregated Schools, 1978. U.S. Government Printing Office Stock No. 1978 0-727-315/1727. This 120-page booklet de-

scribes methodologies for objective examination of desegregated schools and the effects of desegregation on students and teachers. A helpful guide to running a study, this booklet also offers an extensive bibliography on segregation in a social and educational context.

Orfield, Gary, "Desegregation and the Cities - The Trends and Policy Choices," Committee on Human Resources, U.S. Senate, 1977. A frank and frightening examination of current trends and choices, pointing out that segregation is now built into the practices and expectations of urban development, with roots in schools, housing, and unemployment.

St. John, Nancy H., "School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children", John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1975. This is an exhaustive review of nearly all research focusing on the effects of desegregation on children.

Writing or calling the U.S. Office of Education, Tel. (202) 245-8556, or the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is a quick way to track down current information. Federal and state agencies spend a lot of money compiling reports, and agencies are usually happy to make them available. Fortunately, many are quite useful. Specific sources, private and public include:

About Black Americans, Channing L. Bete Co., Inc., 45 Federal Street, Greenfield, MA 01301. Order No. B730-5217. This is an informative, fast and easy-to-read booklet with a chronology of facts about black people and their contribution to America. Illustrated, interesting, and available in quantities at discount.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1121 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20425, Tel. (703) 557-1794. The Commission publishes a wide variety of materials including films, statutory reports, state advisory committee reports, and publications in Spanish, all of which are described in its Catalogue of Publications.

Survey and Reports Branch, Division of Biometry and Epidemiology, Rm 18C - 26PKLN, Parklawn Bldg., 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD., 20857, Tel. (301) 443-4648. This office releases data on

utilization of federally funded CMHCs, with breakdowns by diagnosis; information that is useful in supporting community oriented mental health work.

Some technical materials, not always readily available (such as the U.S. Senate report cited above), can be located only by going to a depository library.

The Depository system was established in the 19th century as a way of disseminating the voluminous output of the federal government. Under this system, libraries are designed on a regional level, usually two per state, to receive all publications distributed by the superintendent of documents. All of this material is indexed, and is relatively easy to find once one masters the various tomes that contain abstracts and call numbers. Some guides to federal documents include The Monthly Catalogue, Government Reports Index and Announcements, the Congressional Information Service Index, and the American Statistics Index. Generally, these sources offer an index based on key words. The key words relate to abstracts, or brief descriptions of the publication, along with a call number. With some help from a librarian in entering the call number correctly, the obscure publication you are seeking can be in hand in a few minutes.

Why bother? One of the best ways to convince people of something is to use facts: facts about discrimination and its effects, facts about the distribution of poverty and disease, facts about utilization of services. In the absence of hard facts, an impressive body of supporting information carries weight.

In addition, it is useful to examine card catalogues at local libraries to determine what information is readily available. University libraries will often carry volumes containing reproductions of card files from the Library of Congress, and can order titles on interlibrary loan.

PART II

SELECTED READINGS

WELCOMING ADDRESS

by Dr. Robert Okin
Commissioner of Mental Health
for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Remarks made at a Conference entitled, School Desegregation, The Role of The Community Mental Health Center, held November 7-10, 1976, in Boston, Massachusetts.

Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Thus proclaimed the Warren Court in the landmark decision of Brown vs. Board of Education. Nearly a quarter of a century later our nation is still struggling to implement this decision and thereby abolish the inequality among races which has infected every part of our social fabric: our schools, our neighborhoods, our patterns of employment.

It is precisely the intimate relationship between segregation in the school system and segregation in housing and employment which has made the Brown decision both so incredibly significant and so complex to implement. The anguish, violence and fear which has been created in the process of desegregating our schools attests to this.

Unfortunately, the extent of this social upheaval has led some to shrink back from the policies which are necessary to implement the court's decision and ultimately from the court's decision itself. As a society, we cannot afford to turn back in this fashion. The court's mandate was correct whatever the pain produced in its implementation. This nation will have nothing to pride itself on if its people cannot live together, go to school together, and work together without enmity, despite differences in color, culture and economic status. And yet the history of the last 20 years has amply demonstrated that this ideal will not be won easily, will not be attained without struggle and anguish in many of our cities. It is precisely this anguish which makes the process of desegregation a mental health issue. As such Community Mental Health Centers (CMHC) have an affirmative responsibility and an aggressive role to play in assisting the communities to deal with the process of desegregation. I stress the word affirmative to convey my conviction that CMHCs should not wait to be asked, nor should they wait until the second act of the drama. They must seek to intervene at the outset when they can often have their greatest impact.

Before dealing with the various strategies of intervention, I want to impress upon you my feeling that centers have an affirmative

responsibility in this arena. First, the CMHC is founded on the concept of the catchment area, the notion that the center has a responsibility to all the people living in a defined geographic area--not merely those who happen to walk through its doors. This responsibility for an entire population is in many ways the most radical aspect of the CMHC legislation, its most telling innovation; it is the characteristic which most clearly differentiates it from the health care system in general and the traditional antecedent forms of mental health care in particular. Indeed, it is the catchment area principle which differentiates the CMHC from almost all pre-existing social legislation in the United States and has the greatest presumptive implications for our center's affirmative action in the desegregation process.

Secondly, the CMHC legislation as elaborated by the National Institute of Mental Health broadened radically the objectives of the traditional mental health system, to include primary and tertiary prevention, not merely treatment of acute disorders.

Intimately related to this was the conviction that the center had a responsibility for improving the quality of peoples' lives not simply helping them solve their intrapsychic conflicts. This emphasis led inevitably to the recognition that the distress endured by people for whom the center was responsible did not merely arise from intrapsychic conflicts but from the interaction of social and economic forces as they affected the individual. No longer could the mental health system view the individual independent from his environment. The CMHC now had a responsibility to actively deal with the social and political environment which was often the source of much of the individual's distress.

The responsibility of the CMHC for a geographically based population, the objective of improving the quality of people's lives, the emphasis on prevention in addition to treatment, a conviction that people cannot be viewed in isolation from their environment, and the necessity of the center to intervene in this environment as the source of both problems and solutions--all of these principles have profound implications for the role of the CMHCs in the desegregation crisis as well as for the particular strategies of incervention in this crisis.

In a sense, the responsibility of the CMHC in dealing with the desegregation crisis is no different in principle than its responsibility in initiating or supporting the struggle against restrictive zoning ordinances which seek to prevent the mentally ill or mentally retarded from living in particular neighborhoods. The center's responsibility in both cases derives from the belief that the individual is affected by his environment, which the center must act upon if it is to truly assist its client and the community. Both involve the center in the struggle for people's civil rights. Both require the center's participation in social action. The center cannot accept its responsibility in the one case and not in the other.

The unhappy fact is that until recently, the CMHC in many places

in the nation has not fully accepted this responsibility in either case. Let me say that there are clearly centers which represent notable exceptions to this generalization in the desegregation of our school system, but in all honesty we must acknowledge that CMHCs in many cities have played no more than a reactive role, have often waited to be invited into the social arena, and have devoted no more than token resources to the efforts when they have ultimately become engaged. What are the reasons for this failure?

First, despite the principles on which community mental health was founded, many professionals as well as citizen boards have not really internalized these principles. Involvement in the social arena therefore has often been seen as an add-on; not the central core of the center's responsibilities. Action has often been eclipsed by pious rhetoric.

Secondly, even when the objectives of community mental health have been internalized, the process of involvement in the social arena has often stirred up a great deal of anxiety among professionals who went into the field of mental health to engage in very different kinds of activities, many of them being confined to the consultation room. The training of mental health professionals even 20 years after the CMHC legislation was enacted and 24 years after Brown vs. the Board of Education, in many places does not adequately equip people for the roles they must play on the firing line in the social arena.

Thirdly, some centers are frightened of being viewed as taking a political stand on major social issues even when the latter have a crucial bearing on the quality of life in the community as well as on the narrower issues of the degree of emotional distress of the center's clients. We must examine this more deeply, for it often stands as the greatest obstacle to active involvement in social issues such as desegregation. The anxiety here is often that taking a stand will so alienate the community as to reduce the latter's support of the center and reduce the center's ability to intervene clinically in the lives of its patients who will be so angry at the center that they will refuse to seek its assistance even for unrelated problems. In a word, the center is often afraid that a political stand will reduce its accessibility to community folks who need help with clinical issues. The possibility of being at war with the community with which the center is charged to assist, and on which the center often depends for its financial viability is a frightening spectre. This is even more complex when the CMHC board which allegedly represents the community has strong feelings about the issue at hand which might be in opposition to those of the staff.

In the fourth case, the crucial question then is not whether CMHCs should be involved in the process of desegregation, but how, in what ways, using what strategies, with what types of personnel, and with what percentage of their resources. A convenient frame-

work might be to think of the issues in terms of strategies of prevention.

1. In the area of primary prevention, the Center should aggressively seek to participate in planning discussions around the strategies of implementation of the desegregation process. The center has a major role to play in assisting community leaders and courts to see that communities must be prepared for radical social transformations. It can help community leaders devise such preparatory interventions. How to prepare the teachers, principals, community institutions for the desegregation of its schools is a major role which can be played by CMHCs.

2. In the area of secondary prevention, the center has a major role in helping the community deal with the pain and violence which certain desegregation implementation processes engender both in black people and in white people. The issue here is not only an ethical one, but the fact that people are in pain. Interventions can range from consultation to educators, clergy, town officials, and children, to riding in busses to help black and white children deal with their fears, negative self-images, etc. Other interventions include dealing with the family crises which result from the desegregation process. These interventions must be active not reactive. The center must be actively not passively available to the community. It must attempt to insure that it will be where the action is, not just back in its offices.

3. The area of tertiary prevention is perhaps the least discussed and most important. It is vital for the center to intervene directly and through consultation and social action to reduce the extent of fear, hatred and isolation between black people and white people after the desegregation process has been fought and won. For winning is not merely achieving desegregation. The ultimate goal of the desegregation process is people living and working together with equal opportunity side by side without fear and enmity. The center must help community leaders develop strategies to achieve this goal and not allow it to be subverted and made more difficult to achieve by the anger and fear which the desegregation process has created.

Interventions in all of these areas are made immeasurably easier if the center <u>board</u> is willing to actively participate in the process. Moreover the extent to which the center is organically connected to the community before the desegregation process begins will have an important influence on its ability to affect the course of this process. If it has not been so connected it will be treated as a foreign body and will likely be extruded. Finally, the use of indigenous workers to deal with the community and its leadership is critical if the center is going to be able to influence community attitudes and behavior.

Before leaving the issue of intervention, it must be noted that

intervention strategies will vary, just as they vary in the clinical arena. Strategies will depend on the relationship of the center to the community, the philosophical position of the board, the extent to which the board and staff are connected to the community, the particular point in the process of desegregation the center enters the arena, and whether or not the center is operating in its own catchment area or that of another center. The attempt to find a cookbook formula is a waste of time and can lead to devastating and fatal mistakes.

In closing, I'd like to reiterate my conviction that this conference should not spend its time debating the issue of whether or not CMHCs should be involved in the desegregation process. Rather, discussion should focus around strategies of intervention. The attempt should be to develop a theoretical framework within which practical modes of action can be developed which take into account the generic as well as the unique aspects of the particular context in which the center exists. Finally, I'd like to stress how important the subject of this conference is. If we are not able to get our children to live together in peace, what hope is there for the next generation of adults?

No. 152—Part II

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 121 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1975 No. 152—Part II

Senate

A CRISIS TEAM APPROACH TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to enter in the RECORD the recent remarks of Congressman ANDREW YOUNG from the Fifth District, Fulton County, Ga., delivered at Boston University Medical Center.

Congressman YOUNG's remarks on the school desegregation plans in Boston are especially important to those of us who have worked to make those plans succeed.

As a close associate of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Congressman YOUNG's remarks clearly reflect the ideals of nonviolence and the determination to persevere for justice through an appeal for reason and understanding.

With the recent resurgence of overt controversy on school desegregation, it is important to formulate ideas and plans that would tap community resources in accomplishing school desegregation as smoothly as possible. Congressman YOUNG offers a remarkable and viable training tool for this purpose.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have Congressman YOUNG's remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT A CRISIS TEAM APPROACH TO BOSTON'S SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

(By The Rev. ANDREW YOUNG, U.S. Congressman)

(NOTE.—Rev. Andrew Young was formerly a close associate of Dr. Martin Luther King in the Southern Leadership Conference. Presently he is a Representative from the Fifth District, Fulton County, Georgia)

The concept which Martin Luther King used in dealing with problems in the South was very similar to yours: it was the crisis team. We never called it that; but by and large when something happened we would take a group of people into the situation. I think the diversity of that group was important—we were all different. Everyone gravitated to the thing which he felt most comfortable with, and there were some people who immediately began to try to keep some control over a situation; and I say that not in any negative sense. It doesn't do anybody any good for chaos to break out. It doesn't do the Black community any good; nor does it do the White community any good. One of the things you have to get over to people is the fact that "when the going gets rough we're going to make progress." I think the history of the struggle in Black America would bear that out if you'd see it. There has not been a single place where violence and chaos happened that any body has made any real progress. The best evidence for that is that it has never repeated itself.

There never has been a single community where violence has occurred that it hasn't occurred again on a later basis. You had a string of riots in the late 60's—or whatever you want to call them. But the people themselves evidently decided that riots didn't do what they wanted them to do, or that the cost was too great to pay, because they never happened again. They're generally a one-time experience. The only city where there have been two riots was in Chicago. On one occasion it was Blacks on the West Side; on the other occasion it was the Chicano community in another part of the city altogether. In the South, the only time we lost a movement (and we didn't lose it altogether) and the only time in ten years that we didn't accomplish what we set out to accomplish, was in Albany, Georgia, where we did not control violence in the Black community and where the Black community lashed out at the police. We found ourselves losing the moral initiative.

The issue then was no longer desegregation of public facilities; but the violence in the Black community. So I would say that generally, in my experience, the persons who are responsible for violence occurring, are not the persons who get blamed for it. I don't think the Black community in most of these riots were responsible for violence—they were blamed for it though. But, the fact that they were successfully blamed for it means that they lost. In Birmingham the year after Albany we convinced the Black community that if violence occurred it was just going to help George Wallace. Any Black folk irresponsible and angry to the point of doing something violent were really playing right into the hands of the Wallace forces. We were able to successfully curtail violence and I can't emphasize that too much.

Dr. King used to talk about three kinds of violence, an aggressive violence, a retaliatory violence, a defensive violence. Basically we have found that the first two just don't help, and the third one doesn't help but it doesn't hurt. I would say that when you're talking about kids in a school situation—and even if they resort to defensive violence they're going to be expelled. Therefore we need someone to help them negotiate their crises. Black folk negotiate all the time. If you can't negotiate you can't survive in the Black community. By and large you're always negotiating your way through situations. There are so many folk in the Black community with a chip on their shoulder and who are looking for someone to beat up on; on every playground, in every candy store. There's someone who's going to try to "take your candy away when you're five years old." By and large you learn how to "keep your candy in your neighborhood." I have a lot of confidence in the kids' ability to use their skills and resources to negotiate in almost any situation they find themselves.

When you look at the history of school desegregation across this country, there's not a single place where the kids have failed. They went into some places that were literally hell, and somehow made it. They made it by using those survival resources they developed from childhood. Black children especially are more prepared for survival than any other people in America. We must help to realize that—some of the same skills they learned to survive with in their neighborhoods are going to help them now.

One of the problems I think you have in Boston is that you don't have nearly enough contact between Blacks and Whites. That's one of the problems in talking so much about how bad the Boston Irish are. They're not that bad. I grew up in an Irish community in Louisiana and they were just as pugnacious. We were the only Blacks in their neighborhood and we fought just about every day, but we didn't lose that many

Those we couldn't win we could outrun! You survive in that kind of situation, and that's not hard for Black folk because they have those survival skills. One of your jobs as a team is to make them confident of their survival skills so that they don't become afraid. I think in any conflict when you get afraid, your mental facilities are paralyzed and you tend to function emotionally and lose. That's in *any* competition, and I think they have to see this as a kind of competition. Your job as a team is to help the various facets of the community realize their own skills.

The only reason we're taking on this problem in the first place is that we have understood that the greatest damage that is done to Black folk is the spiritual and emotional damage that's done by isolation and oppression, we can't cure. I remember the time they put police dogs on the Black folk in Birmingham, and everyone came back panicked into the church, and suddenly it dawned on me that we were up against a dog and a billy-club. I asked how many folk has been hit on the head with a baseball bat, and sure enough about half the church had.

I asked how many had been bitten by a dog. And most folk just in the course of growing up with dogs all over the street had sometime had a dog get a hold of them. What happens is with one you get a lockjaw shot and with the other you have a headache for a while. It didn't produce a concussion. You got hit on the head with a baseball bat, and you kept on going and didn't even stop the game. Then why is it that you're so afraid of this kind of thing? It's typical to get hit on the head with a brick as a kid. There's nothing unusual about it; it happens every day in every community for nothing!

What you're talking about now is your participation in a tremendous social revolution! If you've suffered these kinds of physical accidents for nothing, will you make a decision to suffer them as a necessary part of a tremendous social revolution? Most kids will . . . say "Yeah" that's not a big price to pay. Once they get over that hurdle of not being afraid and if they can analyze the things that can happen to them, and deal with them in their own mind as something they are not going to run from, then most of the problems are solved. Again I don't know all the mechanisms for solving those problems inside kids, but they do it! They come through when you can make them use their heads instead of reacting emotionally or out of fear. It is fear that creates most of the problems.

Your job as part of a crisis team is to find ways to organize a community or school to the point where people understand intellectually what is happening, and not being afraid, that they can make conscious decisions —that this is worth the risk involved. We once said to folk "Look, if the man tells you to go to Viet Nam, you're going to go and not question it, and you're going to fight for somebody else's freedom and maybe lose your life!" The question now is, are you going to do it without questioning it? How much are you willing to do for your own freedom right here in Boston and your own educational opportuntiy? You will find that most of them are willing to do almost anything that's necessary.

Whoever comes up with the best first idea emerges as the leader. In a crisis people tend to get paralyzed and your job is to somehow find a way to break the paralysis. One of the ways of doing that is to do it far enough in advance, and get your contacts. I would think that you're not going to have much trouble from the school kids, because they are already involved and have worked out what their role is. The ones you're going to have the problems with in the crisis are those who are not involved and are guilty because they're not involved. They will appear to be militant to overcome their own guilt about not having done anything.

In the South it was the folk who said "Man, I can't be nonviolent, I'd kill people in a minute, you know." You ask them "How many have you killed. You plan to kill anybody today? Or you got plans to kill somebody tomorrow? If you do, we'll step out of the way and let you go on and kill folk. But, if you're not going to kill anybody today or tomorrow, go ahead and sit down and be cool and let us handle this situation."

Either you've got to decide you're going to be violent; in which case it doesn't make sense to expose yourself, or you got to make a decision to be nonviolent. Every incident of violence has occurred when someone does something crazy on the fringe and runs! This gives the police opportunity to beat up on the people who are exposed. So you've got to get the fringes controlled in a crisis. You need to identify the fringe folk in the community and find a way to communicate with them, in addition to working with the kids who are actually going to be in the situation.

I haven't seen a place yet where folk got together and failed. Usually when we fail it's because we didn't get together and talk about it and plan about it. Since you all are together working as a team and working out a concept you're going to take care of business. So God bless you.

MENTAL HEALTH INTERVENTION IN COMMUNITY CRISES

by Ruth M. Batson and Lyda S. Peters
Boston University Division of Psychiatry

Introduction

In 1961 the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health published a report entitled, Action for Mental Health, which assessed the quality of care at large state hospitals and argued for the development of centers located within local communities as a means of reducing the need for prolonged or repeated hospitalization. Although its final report was primarily hospital focused, it did serve a two-fold purpose: it set the stage for federal action which would alert the American people to the inequities and inadequacies of the mental health system in our country; and allowed President John Kennedy an opportunity to introduce a concept of community based care which stressed a far broader concept of mental health within a public health framework.

Concepts of community care and prevention, however, are not entirely new and can be traced back more than fifty years, yielding a historical base from which to argue the importance of community health systems and support. Adolph Meyer has written:

> Communities have to learn what they produce in the way of mental problems and waste of human opportunities, and with such knowledge will rise from mere charity and mere mending, or hasty propaganda to well-balanced early care, prevention, and general gain of health.

It is our purpose in this paper to present the need and the rationale for innovation in non-traditional areas of community mental health care delivery. Our intent is to examine why mental health caregivers have been slow to intervene in issues of a political nature. We will also suggest some alternative models which might help understand the reasons why we feel strongly that community crisis intervention is an integral part of a community mental health center's service program mandate. Specifically, we will look at mental health professional intervention in the school desegregation crisis.

In February, 1963, President John F. Kennedy declared that it was time for a "bold new approach" to mental illness: to place mental health care back in the mainstream of American medicine. This new approach encompassed many levels of care, not the least of which was the provision of services to "underpriviledged" areas and residents of those areas. Community-based care with an emphasis

on the individual supported by a healthy social environment is pervasive throughout Kennedy's remarks to Congress:

> Prevention is far more desirable for all concerned.... Prevention will require both selected specific programs directed especially at known causes, and the general strengthening of our fundamental community, social welfare, and educational program which can do much to eliminate or correct the harsh environmental conditions, which often are associated with mental retardation and mental illness.... Services to both the mentally ill and to the mentally retarded must be community-based and provide a range of services to meet community needs. [Custodial isolation must be]...supplanted by the open warmth of community concern and capability. [Emphasis added]

Community care was an important part of the conceptualization of comprehensive community mental health centers, and John Kennedy spoke of the need for these centers to focus community resources and provide better community facilities for all aspects of mental health care with prevention as a major activity. Clearly he intended that these centers be designed to serve the mental health needs of the community.

Throughout his address he acknowledged the inequities of the existing system of care, especially with respect to the needs of the poor and oppressed within our society. He spoke of families deprived of the basic necessities of life, opportunity and motivation, and noted the unfavorable health factors inherent within these groups. He acknowledged that poverty and medical indigency are at the root of most of the problems surrounding mental illness and retardation. In his message to Congress we find the foundation from which our philosophy arises: that mental health services include a concept of community-centered programs arising from needs determined by social and environmental forces; that these programs should provide a coordinated range of timely services including health, education, training, employment, welfare, and legal, and that we need to reinforce the will and capacity of our communities to meet these problems in order that the communities, in turn, can reinforce the will and capacity of individuals, their families and communities. To summarize, President Kennedy's primary aim in proposing the concept of comprehensive community mental health services was "to promote to the best of our ability and by all possible and appropriate means--the mental and physical health of all our children." Here, we see clearly the foundation of our work in community crisis intervention.

The Community Mental Health Centers Act of October, 1963 marked a public commitment to abolish a two-class system of care--one for the rich and the other for the poor, and to provide decent, first-rate mental health services to the millions of American people

of all racial and ethnic backgrounds that the National Institute of Mental Health estimated to be in need of mental health services. This legislation opened a new era for mental health:

> Community mental health centers promised a clear reversal in public policy: instead of "protecting the community" by segregating the "mentally ill" in huge far-away institutions, the "ill" were to be protected and even cared for in small community centers.

This comprehensive involvement of mental health professionals in community issues which impact on the mental health and well being of residents described by President Kennedy provides the basis for community crisis intervention. Crisis intervention is not a new concept but its location within the community mental health centers as a community outreach service is. By the same token, the national reaction to court-ordered school desegregation is a practical mental health problem embedded in the notion of community crisis intervention. Mental health professionals are accustomed to dealing with individual crises which are part of the patient-therapist treatment modality. Community crisis intervention reverses that movement and places itself in the context of all individuals who are subject to the stresses of a supra-individual crisis. The mental health/mental illness "fall-out" generated by the reactions to school desegregation exemplifies the necessity of professional intervention both with individuals and with groups (parents, families, communities).

This "fall-out" can be couched in acceptable mental health terms: anxiety, dislocation, and terror, all of which contribute to reducing people's capacity to adjust and inhibits them from progressing to resolutions of their own personal crises. Children, especially in desegregated schools, become depressed, anxious, and show symptoms of sleeplessness, increased asthmatic attacks and hyperactivity in disproportionate numbers. Most parents manifest degrees of frustration and hostility, are often overcome by anger and fear, and find themselves depressed and unable to function adequately on their jobs and at home. Some white parents live in constant terror in their own neighborhoods, cars vandalized, homes terrorized, in a mood of pervasive fear of being victimized by their neighbors because of their compliance with the law. Families are dismantled, marriages destroyed, and family and community polarization become the norm. What is the role of mental health professionals who could use their resources and skills to provide an emotional haven or resting place within the community for those in need of services? Is this not part of comprehensive mental health care?

Public Law 94-63's definition of a community mental health center is:

> Title III community mental health centers require specific quality and comprehensiveness of a community mental health center. The requirements include, but are not limited to:

> - A community mental health center shall ensure that persons receiving services have access to all health and social services they require;
>
> - Mental health services through community mental health centers shall coordinate with the services of other health and social agencies;
>
> - Services shall be available and accessible 24 hours a day and 7 days a week to the residents of the area and in a manner which preserves human dignity and assures continuity of high quality care and which overcomes geographical, cultural, linguistic and economic barriers.

In the first twelve years of the Community Mental Health Center Act, the National Institute of Mental Health expended over one billion dollars to fund over 603 centers throughout the nation, making services available to over 87 million people. It has now been sixteen years since the passage of the original Community Mental Health Center Act:

> The Committee therefore confirms the original intent of the Community Mental Health Center Act of 1963; that the federal role is one of providing construction and operational funds to new centers to initiate a program of mental health services on a community basis throughout the nation....

It has been twenty-five years since Brown vs. Board of Education (II) - the first school systems in the nation ordered by the courts to desegregate (Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware):

> ...The district courts [shall] enter such orders and decrees ...as are necessary and proper to admit [plaintiffs] to public schools on a racially non-discriminatory basis with all deliberate speed...;

And it has been over four years since the first northern urban school district was ordered by the courts to desegregate as shown in Milliken vs. Bradley:

> ...We find that both the state of Michigan and the Detroit Board of Education have committed acts which have been causal factors in the segregated conditions of the public schools of the city of Detroit.... It is, the court believes, unfortunate that we cannot deal with public school segregation on a no-fault basis, for if racial segregation in our public schools is an evil, then it should make no difference whether we classify it de jure or de facto...if fault or blame must be found it is that of the community as a whole.... There is enough blame for everyone to share.
>
> Nowhere in this nation have we found any concerted effort or

institutional response on the part of community mental health centers--only individual motivators, who by the circumstances of the times found themselves employed by a community mental health center. Surely, an issue of such national significance, with its corresponding mental health problems, should be viewed within the realm of community mental health services and programs. Public health, social service, welfare, the courts, law enforcement agencies and, of course, schools were all impacted by the "fall-out" generated by reaction to school desegregation. Why would the community mental health movement feel that this would be outside its realm of services?

Perhaps one might find an answer in an illustration of Judge David C. Bazelon, who told of a mother who called her doctor asking for help because her son was very ill with a fever, nausea and cramps. "Is he having fits?" the doctor asked. When the mother replied "no," the doctor said, "That's too bad, because I'm terrific on fits." Mental health centers are great on fits, but what happens to a community that is not having a fit?

Another reason for lack of responsiveness is that many professionals see the reaction to school desegregation as a social problem and not directly involved with mental health. Most are uncertain what to do and virtually everyone is afraid. Perhaps it is because the medical model, from which comprehensive community mental health centers operate, conceptualizes a wide range of mental disorders as if they were physical illnesses, thereby barring such reactions and responses to "political" issues.

Perhaps it can be explained by a GAO report of 1974 which stated that a better job needed to be done to identify local mental health needs in the community mental health centers nationwide. Because, of course, needs must be identified before they can be met. This report found that the program's emphasis was often determined by the availability of funds to match federal grants and by the interest of the center's professional staff. And this same report criticized the National Institute of Mental Health's emphasis in early years on getting centers operational and making services available, rather than on learning from the community what services it considered important. But whatever the reason, the need is clear and the time has come. Community crises are within the realm of mental health service delivery. Our country's institutions have not reduced the daily stresses which overcome citizens and, in fact, unemployment, crime, delinquency, inadequate housing, racism, and the like are increasing. Concurrent with rising incidence rates is an inverse relationship to the amount of services and resources available to eradicate these ills. Yet, they will not go away and must be addressed with the resources and institutions that do exist, or our society will progress to its demise. This is what necessitated our work in community crisis intervention.

The Boston Case

In 1787, a petition to open Boston schools to black citizens was denied. In 1854, black citizens and abolitionist groups supported the legal suit brought by a black father against the city of Boston--Roberts vs. Boston. This action resulted in legislation a year later, which said in part:

> In determining the qualifications of scholars to be admitted into any district school in the Commonwealth, no distinction shall be made on account of the race, color, or religious opinion of the applicant or scholar.

Later, this ruling was broadened to include inns, places of amusement, etc. This was the beginning of efforts on the part of black people in Boston to gain educational opportunity.

In 1946, the Fair Employment Practice Law was enacted, the forerunner of the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination. In 1944, when the black population of Boston was approximately six percent, the Boston Finance Commission asked for and was granted $75,000 for a study of the Boston School System. The contract was made with a Dr. George Strayer of New York. One of the reasons given for the need for this report was that no general survey or appraisal of the objectives and education methods of the Boston schools had been made for two decades and the changing needs of public education due to the war would offer new challenges to all public education systems. Professor Strayer documented the inadequacy of the school buildings--most of which were located in the black section of Boston.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court rejected its earlier opinion of the well known Plessey vs. Ferguson decision upholding the separate but equal doctrine, and in Brown vs. Board of Education the court concluded that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place and separate education facilities are inherently unequal.

This decision spurred the activities of a growing group of parents and citizens in Boston concerned about the quality of education being received by black students. Their actions culminated in a hearing by the Public School Committee of the Boston Branch of the NAACP before the Boston School Committee on June 11, 1963. This confrontation led to a series of protest actions and legislative maneuvers, none of which were successful in bringing the Boston School Committee or the black community closer in agreement on the educational needs of black students.

Finally, a coalition of groups started work on legislation designed to eliminate racial imbalance and in 1965 Massachusetts passed the first state law against de facto segregation--The Racial Imbalance Act. This state law provided for the limitation of imbalanced schools--imbalance being defined by law as any school with a non-

white population of over 50 per cent. If a city were found to have imbalanced schools, the school committee was required to submit a plan to correct the imbalance. The School Committee's response was to spend a good deal of energy and time in efforts to repeal this legislation. In the meantime, parent action escalated.

In September, 1965 a group of black parents comprehensively surveyed the schools, found empty seats, raised money for busses and transported their children to these schools under the leadership of a newly established organization--Operation Exodus.

In September, 1966 as a result of the efforts of a coalition of suburban and inner city groups, Metropolitan Council for Education Opportunity (METCO) transported 225 black students (kindergarten through 10th grade) to seven suburban communities. This voluntary bussing exchange program still exists.

Finally in 1972, the Boston Branch of the NAACP filed a suit in the Federal District Court in behalf of black students and parents. The case is known as Tallullah Morgan, et. al., vs. James W. Hennigan, et. al. The complaint alleged that all black children in Boston public schools had been denied equal protection of the law by the Boston School Committee. This, the complaint stated, had been accomplished through the maintenance of racial segregation in the public schools.

The history of the involvement of the Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center in the Boston desegregation crisis can be understood by looking at how the mental health movement originated in Massachusetts. In 1964, the Mental Health Commission for Massachusetts recommended thirty-seven community mental health centers which were to provide comprehensive mental health coverage for all citizens of the Commonwealth. At that time, it was estimated that the Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center would have responsibility for a population of 157,000. In terms of the four categories of need utilized by the Planning Commission, the Roxbury-South End community of Boston ranked fourth socio-economically, first in illness, first in social pathology, first in the number of welfare recipients, and, of the thirty-seven "catchment areas," ranked first in terms of total need. The mental health catchment area (Area 602) served by the Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center (SCFMCH) experienced a 28 per cent total excess mortality in the years 1972-1973. In other words, this area experienced a mortality ratio two or more times that of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a whole.

Collaborative planning with the community to address these problems started around 1963 with the formation of a community advisory committee whose initial members were representatives of Boston's South End. Shortly thereafter, leaders and community residents of Roxbury also formed an advisory group. Monthly meetings were also attended by senior faculty of Boston University School of Medicine,

and eventually various schools of Boston University became involved in the planning process. These were the Schools of Education, Nursing, Social Work, Theology (Pastoral Counseling), Communication, Sargent College (occupational therapy), the graduate departments of Psychology and Socio-Anthropology, and the Law-Medicine Research Institute. When the Mental Health Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was passed in 1966, the community advisory board became the Area Board and an advisory body to the Commissioner of Mental Health. Over the years, the Area Board has been made up of representatives from the various geographic and population segments of the catchment area. It has drawn attention to the needs of the Hispanic population, the mentally retarded, the elderly, and children, among others. Members of the Area Board have also given deeper insight into the mental health implications of poverty, inadequate housing, poor education, the prevalence of drugs and alcohol, and the lack of available preventative programs. A unique alliance has been formed between the Area Board and many staff members with a common goal of bringing quality mental health services to the community.

The planning process was facilitated through state and federal funding in 1969 by the Center's Consultation and Education Program. Consultation and Education has been the primary liaison between the community and the Center, and has been one of the key groups in advocacy of clients. In 1972, the National Institute of Mental Health Paraprofessional Manpower Development Branch funded a New Careers Program developed by Consultation and Education. Graduates from this program have been community residents who have continued to work at the Center and at other human service agencies in the community.

During the period from 1970 to 1976, the relationship between the Mental Health Center and Boston University was redefined. It had become obvious that the two institutions had different goals and strengths as well as common areas of interest. The decision was made that Center and Division of Psychiatry staff were to be distinct; however, collaboration would continue in many areas. In 1974, the Center was renamed the Doctor Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center, in honor of the country's first black psychiatrist, an 1897 graduate of and later faculty member at Boston University School of Medicine, who in many ways symbolizes the aspirations and goals of the Center. In March of 1976, Center programs started moving into the new facility.

Twelve comprehensive mental health services are provided by the mental health center: inpatient, outpatient, partial hospitalization, emergency, consultation and education, screening, drug addiction and drug abuse services, services for children and alcoholism. Services for the elderly, follow-up and traditional services are now being established. Aside from the main facility on East Newton Street, several programs maintain offices at other locations in the catchment area. The catchment area includes Roxbury, North Dorchester,

the South End and Back Bay with a population of approximately 115,000 representing 28 ethnic groups. In addition to the majority population, which is comprised mainly of black and white residents, the catchment area contains a large Spanish-speaking group, and smaller Oriental, Native American and other ethnic populations.

In February 1974, at a meeting of the Division Advisory Committee of Boston University Division of Psychiatry, Ruth M. Batson, Associate Professor of Psychiatry (Community Psychiatry) and Director of the Consultation and Education Program at Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center, raised the issue of an expected decision from the federal court to desegregate Boston Public Schools and predicted the negative reaction to this decision. Mrs. Batson asked what posture the Division and the Mental Health Center would take in support of catchment area families who would be affected by the reaction to a court decision in favor of the plaintiffs. The response was mixed, with some members of the Committee expressing the feeling that desegregation of public schools was a social and/or political issue which did not fall within their professional jurisdiction. The discussion continued within the various departments of the Mental Health Center and the Division of Psychiatry with the responses being more explicit:

--this is a social issue not a mental health issue

--even if we wanted to help, we haven't the resources, financial or personnel

--we haven't been trained to work on political or social issues

Various cities throughout the United States which had gone through desegregation, or which were at that time going through the process, were contacted and asked to describe the role of the mental health agencies in their communities during school desegregation. The purpose of this informal survey was to shed some light on how mental health centers could proceed in Boston. It was expected that this kind of questioning would produce publicized and studied experiences of Community Mental Health Centers throughout the country as they dealt with similar crises. This was not the case. In fact, we found evidence to the contrary. Responses indicated that in the majority of cases, community mental health centers described their role as one of maintaining "low profiles." This "low profile" phenomenon can best be described as a lack of an overt institutional response. However, when a community is overwhelmed by severe crises, the lack of a response on the part of community mental health centers must not be misconstrued as non-involvement. When an institution ignores an obvious need, this inaction becomes the institution's decision (although not necessarily a conscious one) to do nothing. That, in itself, is their response.

School opened in September 1974, and Boston had its first experience with the hostility of school desegregation through court-

ordered busing. Although Phase I (1974–1975), as that first year's program was called, did not involve the whole city, it stirred up such passions and problems that busing in Boston became national news. Phase I was to be followed in the 1975–1976 school year by a city-wide desegregation program, renamed Phase II. Based on the experience of Phase I, persons of widely differing political viewpoints looked on the opening of school as a time of crisis and potential disaster.

Within the Fuller Mental Health Center the Consultation and Education Program was particularly sensitive and responsive to community issues. The Consultation and Education Program, in concert with other community agencies, had attempted to help during Phase I, when staff members rode buses with Roxbury children into hostile areas of Boston. Other persons worked in the schools trying to help adolescents deal with their emotions in this tense situation. The staff heard many reports from other mental health workers and community residents: problems in the police stations and courts, the plight of bilingual-speaking parents and children, rumors and counter-rumors that added to everyone's distress.

During this period many persons were gaining experience in how to deal with this particular type of crisis. For many it was not a totally new experience. The community agencies in Roxbury were used to responding to urban crises as they occured: they were familiar with street work with crowds, with organizing citizens around community issues, with group work with children and adolescents. All of these experiences were useful in dealing with the community crisis precipitated by reactions to Phase I.

At the same time other agencies and individuals showed themselves less able to deal with this type of situation--specifically the more traditionally organized mental health institutions. They were not accustomed to responding to community-wide crises and their personnel, though willing, were not trained to be effective in this type of work. Nevertheless, it was clear that mental health workers could bring to a community crisis specific and valuable skills--the tools of their craft: observations, focusing group discussion, understanding roles and maintaining neutrality under pressure. Mental health workers have also been trained in the understanding and treatment of actions which require the ability to distinguish between behavior which is part of the continuing problems of certain individuals.

In March 1975, Lydia Peters, Director of the New Careers Program, Ruth Batson, Director of Consultation and Education, and Donald Taylor, Associate Area Director of the Fuller Mental Health Center, after discussion and meetings with other interested co-workers, went to Washington D.C. to meet with Dr. James Ralph, Chief of the Minority Center of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Dr. Ralph was asked how NIMH was intervening in

school desegregation, especially in instances such as Boston where violence had erupted. The Boston group pointed out the mental health implications of what was happening and asked for specific funding to help alleviate this situation. After much consultation about ways in which this could be done through the NIMH mechanisms, a supplement to Boston University Medical Center's Training Grant application, New Careers in Mental Health, was submitted to the Paraprofessional Manpower Development Branch, Division of Manpower and Training Programs, NIMH. It was funded for a period of one year in the amount of $38,000.

This supplemental training program proposed to train between twenty and thirty New Careerists, other paraprofessionals, select groups of professional community people, and persons from other involved and affected human service agencies. The purpose was to provide such trainees with the skills necessary to be effective intervenors in the ongoing desegregation crisis and other community wide crises. This program was a direct response to a continuing community crisis that was provoked by reactions to Boston's desegregation plan. While it did respond to the vital need for services created by that crisis, neither its conception nor its goals were limited to that situation. The Community Crisis Intervention Program grew from long years of experience which indicated that:

--there is such a thing as a community crisis;

--such a crisis generates real mental health needs;

--paraprofessionals from the community possess skills uniquely amenable to community crisis intervention;

--a training and utilization effort was both feasible and necessary.

The Boston school desegregation crisis was the catalyst required to initiate such a program. From the comfortable perspective offered by hindsight, it might be said to have been tailor-made for the purpose. It was a clear and present crisis which led to well-defined and easily perceived mental health problems--problems which literally arrived at the doorsteps of the city's mental health agencies.

Some of the accomplishments of the Community Crisis Intervention Training Program include:

1) the design and implementation of an intensive summer training program in Community Crisis Intervention as a response to the emergency created by school desegregation in Boston;

2) the recruitment, training, placement, and supervision of 30 professional and paraprofessional mental health workers to serve as crisis intervenors at strategic locations in the city of Boston;

3) providing consultation and technical assistance to community agencies in planning their activities in response to the crisis;

4) planning and coordinating a coherent response to the crisis within the Solomon Carter Fuller Mental Health Center;

5) stimulating the active interest of other regional community mental health centers in Community Crisis Intervention.

The community mental health centers in Boston generally have followed the nation-wide pattern of avoiding any significant direct and/or overt response to the school desegregation crisis. The Fuller Mental Health Center (known at that time as the Boston University Mental Health Center) was unique in that it did respond in a focused way and created the concept of specific roles for mental health personnel in community crises resulting from social and political change. Articulation of this new, innovative form of institutional response to subtle and complex realities of urban life has been a major contribution to the mental health field. The task for the 1980s is to maintain the momentum and to assure that crisis intervention is accepted as a legitimate approach to chronic and episodic community health problems.

RACISM, SCHOOL INTEGRATION CRISES, AND MENTAL HEALTH

by Sanford I. Cohen, M.D.
Professor and Chairman
Division of Psychiatry
Boston University School of Medicine

Adapted from remarks made at a workshop on school busing crisis team.

Familiarity with the disease aspect of racism and its effect on mental health can help mental health crisis workers understand the context of a crisis and develop strategies.

Racism has many components that affect the educational, political, and mental health system in different ways. It is not a busing problem, or a school problem, or a problem with the kids. Racism is a national disease, a social crisis, and a public health problem.

The task for mental health workers is to prevent the spread of this contagious and destructive disease. Viewing it in this perspective will help provide realistic expectations, and help establish goals specific to the disease as it exists in particular communities.

In the following pages, we will examine several aspects of racism:

- Mental Health Implications of the Racial Imbalance Issue
- Definition of Racism
- Significance of Prejudice
- Information Deficit and Stereotyped Perceptions
- Characteristics of the Prejudiced Person
- Consequences of Discrimination and Approaches to Modify
- Crisis Intervention and the School Problem

1. Mental Health Implications of the Racial Imbalance Issue

When one reviews the mental health problems of this area it is clear that the effects of racism on the development of children are

among the major problems with which we are confronted. It is a terrible and tragic situation, that a major crisis is occurring and yet it is not recognized by large segments of the population. Many of the citizens involved appear to be unwilling to face the desperate need to act on this problem, because of its terribly disruptive effect on communities and individuals. This immediately leads us to the fact that politicians have used this situation, played on people's feelings and influenced their judgement by encouraging hatred. This has prevented citizens from mobilizing themselves so as to deal with the social, educational and, particularly, the economic issues with which they should all be concerned.

The primary value of the Supreme Court decision on education was not so much its contribution to education, but its opposition to the theory of the supremacy of one group over any other. The climate of racism in this country seems to rise and fall as the attitudes and behavior of political leaders either impede or implement the policies and philosophy set forth by the Supreme Court. If the political leaders, particularly in this community, really appreciated the tragic and destructive consequences of continuing to fan the flame of racism perhaps they would behave differently. The fact is that political leaders are capable of behaving differently, as can be noted during war time when a bi-partisan policy is adopted. For some reason, politicians do not see the danger from within our nation at the present moment in time and seem to lack an awareness that the erosion occuring in our cities is greater than perhaps at times when we were at war. Because of this they do not see the need for bi-racial as well as bi-partisan policy to combat this internal danger.

Many factors enter into the current school problem, but one area of prime importance is the fact that the people who control the governmental and educational systems have allowed the racial issue to be highlighted. Rather than attempting to help citizens control their fears and biases so that other more primary issues can be dealt with, it sometimes appears that political leaders have used the issue of public education to play on individual prejudices and fears. This has been very successful in diverting white and black parents from focusing on very real educational and economic issues.

The education provided by the Boston school systems is dismal, and many people have clamored for a change both in administration and in programming. If the parents, on the other hand, were allowed to get past their feelings about each other, they could discover how badly their children were being educated and the changes that needed to be made.

Busing is only a means of achieving racial balance which in turn is a necessary step to allow students, parents and teachers of all segments of our society to share problems and to share resources. The continued separation of groups of children from large segments of our population can have very serious psychological consequences in

addition to the imbalance in educational opportunities which exist.

Racism affects all children, and the failure to allow all children and parents to share the same problems will continue to foster prejudicial attitudes and discrimination and this will damage the personality of all children, minority and majority. The Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children has indicated that racism is a more pervasive and serious threat than childhood schizophrenia, mental retardation or neurosis. Its destructive effects severely cripple growth and development of children.

White children also suffer consequences of racism--in different ways--but still in ways which weaken our whole nation. The opportunity to achieve is blunted as bigoted attitudes are communicated to white children. These attitudes create a feeling that they are superior. It is a way of keeping down the ambitions of poor white children.

For how many has racism been used as a tool of manipulation to allow room at the top for only a chosen few? Self-esteem is crippled and the drive to realize ambition is blocked by the influence of some fantasy of natural superiority. In some children, confusion, conflict and cynicism will grow as a consequence of being taught moral, religious and democratic principles of brotherhood of man and the importance of justice, while witnessing segregation, discrimination and injustice in homes and communities.

Improving the racial balance will, of course, provide improved opportunities for learning and it will help different groups learn about each other. However, we can be sure it will create tensions. This is to be expected since racist practices ingrained in the structure of schools will be exposed. If we accepted the presence of racist and bigoted attitudes as a reality and as a danger, we would invite this confrontation. Failure to balance the schools will deprive communities of the opportunity to undo the fixed bias which pervades our school system and social system.

However, racial balance must concern not only parents and children, but teachers. We must have good teachers of all races available to all children. It is especially important to have an increased number of minority teachers:

For black students--to provide them with role models

For white students--to undermine their prejudice and stereotypes

There is nothing magical about racially balanced schools. In fact, in the current atmosphere, we can expect an increase in tension if children are shifted. This will not be so difficult to handle if parents and teachers form alliances to support efforts to involve kids with one another. Indeed, if parents were able to communicate and

collaborate, it is likely that children would have little difficulty learning to live and learn together.

In schools where integration was accepted as law and enforced so that individual attitudes were not allowed to undermine the educational efforts, not only were academic achievements noted, but changes in social attitudes occurred. Individual racial contact in and of itself will not necessarily bring about increased understanding, tolerance or acceptance of each other. In fact, we can be sure it will create confrontations, and the important thing is to make that a useful and not a destructive experience.

Rather than brotherhood week, we should have confrontation week. We must not dread confrontation, but push it, so that people can be given a chance to change. The educational process must allow for every class at every grade level to be able to discuss attitudes and feelings. Perhaps we must make this nation one big encounter group dedicated to immediate change of our national character.

2. Definition of Racism

A distinguished black actor defined racism as the belief that human races have distinct characteristics usually involving the idea that one's own race is superior and has a right to rule another. Wilkinson defines racism as the behavior of whites to blacks based on the concept of white superiority. As the principles of white superiority are culturally learned, racism may be regarded as institutionalized.

Institutionalized patterns have the unfortunate effect of influencing behavior of people who under other circumstances might not be ardent bigots. One who lives in a community often ends up going along automatically with the prevailing patterns. This equals not only conforming, but learning how to discriminate and how to teach one's children to do the same. A person often is not even able to acknowledge the fact that his freedom of choice about association with others is curtailed by this influence.

Pierce's definition of racism is quite simple. He states that it is behavior that results from a mental attitude about skin color. The fact that a mental attitude cannot be changed in face of contrary evidence makes it by definition, according to Pierce and others, a delusion.

Racism, both in its specific individual and its broader institutional sense must be considered as a cause of major psychological problems for individuals and a major cultural problem for society. It is important to emphasize that there are a variety of subtle and overt ways that mental health practices have contributed to the perpetuation of racism and anti-humanistic activities. It just does not

seem logical to assume that the mental health system is any less immune to the pervasive influence of prejudice than other institutions. In fact it is suggested that if racism is a major endemic mental illness then it would follow that a major task for mental health workers would be to discern its causes and direct its cure. However, a major question is: Can the mental health apparatus of this country succeed in creating an effective machinery to support a concerted attack on racism?

Mental health encompasses a great deal more than concerns about mental illness. Mental health includes consideration of both illness and health as well as being concerned with people's feelings of worth in the context of total cultural and societal system.

The mental health profession often considers itself remarkably free of bias and prejudice. It sometimes appears that persons working in the mental health system view themselves as paragons of humanitarianism. Yet this very attitude inhibits professionals from properly assessing their role in perpetuating racist practices. It is most essential that all persons working in the field of mental health services recognize how very pervasive racial attitudes are, and how nobody could possibly be totally free from their effects. It is irresponsible to hold onto the premise that psychiatric theories have somehow been immune to the effects of racist thinking. It is therefore necessary for all those in clinical psychiatric fields to examine how current theories and practices have served to perpetuate racism.

There has been a particularly unhealthy emphasis more recently on pathology of individuals growing up from the black ghetto. This emphasis is not by people who are consciously racist. In fact, to the contrary, this particular emphasis is by people interested in social reform who are concerned with the unequal distribution of social, educational and economic resources in our society. However, even amongst these individuals it is impossible to cite any studies in which the results indicated any positive aspects of mental health of the black ghetto child or the various assets and strengths of these children. This poses a particular problem for individuals working in crisis intervention in the Boston school crisis, because the focus of a crisis team must be on the positive aspect of personality or ego capacities or adaptive capacities.

Many theories are put forth to explain deficits noted in so-called poor ghetto blacks. Again the concept is on the damage which has been done. Dr. Peter Wolf has indicated that in children we probably can be comfortable in stating with some assurance that there is no evidence for biologically fixed critical periods of cognitive development. It is unfortunate that this is not better understood because some of the tentative hypotheses about cognitive and intellectual deficits have become "established facts". This may be one way that a consciously non-racist person explains certain feelings he has about differences of blacks and whites.

In this section, we are concerned with the definition of racism. Therefore, there is a need to sharpen the distinction between institutional racism and individual prejudice. Pettigrew also calls our attention to the important difference between the driven and the conforming racist. This is important to understand since an understanding of these categories of bias might help to reduce some of the defensiveness displayed by people who behave in a racist fashion but who are not consciously bigoted individuals. It is this group of individuals who are terribly hurt when their behavior is pointed out.

Pettigrew defined prejudice as an emotional mode of mental function which involves rigid prejudgement and misjudgement of human groups. He then goes on to define ethnocentrism as an organized system of ideas or ideology characterized by rigid ingroup and outgroup distinctions as well as stereotyped and hostile attitudes of our groups.

Discrimination is defined as the action component of intergroup prejudice while discriminatory behavior is defined as the acting out of intergroup prejudice against the outgroup. For a behavior to constitute direct discrimination, the acting out must limit the opportunity of choice which is open to the victimized group. It would be possible for a consciously non prejudiced person to engage in a discriminatory act and Pettigrew points out that it is important to recognize that individual racism involves both prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory behavior. An anti-black orientation is fundamentally based on the assumption of superiority of the white race but Pettigrew states that individual racism does not operate in a psychological vacuum since it always acts within some social and institutional setting. He goes on to define institutional racism as that complex of institutional arrangements that restrict the life choices of black Americans in comparison to those of white Americans. A vital point made by Pettigrew is that an attack on institutional racism may be needed more than many of the brotherhood sermons and dinners which are held. He also points out that racist institutions need not be headed by racists or be designed with racist intentions. Many of the arrangements were originally designed and established to serve positive functions of the institutions without any thought of racism. They have been maintained precisely because they do in fact accomplish certain positive functions. However, there are other effects of institutional structures which need to be looked at and modified. The problem is not simply to eliminate racist arrangements but to replace arrangements that serve positive functions with similar activities without racist consequences.

Pettigrew tried to estimate the distribution of different types of bigotry. He feels that anti-black views and behavior are not nearly as expressive as they are socially adaptive in a racist society. He quotes a study that suggests that 3/5 of white Americans are what he calls conforming bigots while 1/5 are non-bigots and 1/5 are driven bigots. If his findings are correct, institutions must take a very strong stand. Institutional change would have its greatest effect

on the largest group of all--the conforming bigots. Non-racist norms of institutions could establish new references and new expectations for conforming bigots to live up to.

If an institution, society, or court system does commit itself to change this would be an important step, but one must remember that this will probably be associated with considerable distress. It might be useful to review some of the ways that people belonging to the dominant group might react to change and why the distress is felt even when a clear-cut commitment has been made. The question one has to ask when a commitment to social change is made is: Would we be confronted with a reaction to uncertainty associated with change and is the distress which is felt therefore related to the very commitment to change which is felt to be desirable? The reaction may be related to the way people try to adapt to changes in social conditions in a short interval. Many individuals feel uncomfortable, even overwhelmed, by change and may try to block out unwelcome realities. Hence, individuals try to deal with the changing world as if it had not changed at all.

Another method of attempting to adapt is a sort of obsessive reversion to previously successful patterns that may be irrelevant and inappropriate. In this kind of effort one tries to maintain previously programmed decisions and habits. The more that changes seem to occur, the more meticulously one tries to repeat past modes of action or past relationships.

A passionate and unyielding angry response may offer a simple way out of the complexity of choice. This type of reaction is associated with narrowing one's choices. If an individual feels unable to cope with the complexity of change then violent behavior may substitute for thoughts which are confusing because the familiar order of things has changed.

In dealing with racism, changes which represent progress also represent sources of conflict. As a community or a society or an organization attempts to become less racist or less elitist, people will become more mobile within the structure of that community. The price that we probably pay for this very necessary social advance is an increasing uncertainty about the roles which people play in relationship to other people.

Conflicts related to social class and cultural differences seem to be a function of efforts to perpetuate or continue stereotyped, bigoted attitudes. These efforts come into conflict with efforts to change these attitudes. When people can strive more successfully for higher status, relationships between people change. This change is part of social progress but it may also lead to an increase in tension. The changes are necessary, good, and useful but nevertheless they represent change and change in itself creates problems which we must identify so we can effectively deal with them.

3. Significance of Prejudice

Prejudice, intolerance and closed minds are major obstacles for any kind of collaboration between people in their efforts for a more satisfactory style of human living. Bigotry and prejudice impair the capacity to relate. This impairment impoverishes and distorts life expereince for both a prejudiced person and his target.

Prejudice is not only a psychological problem; it has to be regarded as a social device. In a sense it is an aspect of an ideology and a value system which is necessary to maintain an elitist economic and educational arrangement. This may be one important factor which continues to perpetuate prejudice.

The systematic exclusion of groups is a way of perpetuating social distance and a way of preserving one's own group status as well as keeping other groups vulnerable for exploitation. Institutionalized prejudice, i.e., prejudice which operates outside of a person's awareness can distort, impoverish, and openly destroy the lives of an entire society or culture.

A fixed belief about the goals of a target group, the inability to submit certain evidence to rational scrutiny, an invarying "fear of the stranger" and a persisting anxiety based on the need to demonstrate one's strength can make the deicisions of a group or even a nation a rather risky business.

When a hostile and depreciatory attitude cannot be modified by experiences that demonstrate the irrationality of the attitude or when the possessor of the attitude avoids confrontation with the facts that may threaten it, it is likely that the attitude serves a necessary psychological function. A tenaciously embraced antipathy reflects a functional impairment in reality and may prove behavior in the prejudiced persons which is maladaptive, destructive and paranoid. Furthermore, victims of prejudice are affected. The prejudice of a power-holding majority can limit severely the freedom of a target group.

4. Information Deficit and Stereotyped Perceptions

These two topics represent some specific aspects of prejudice which may be useful to define. To begin with, in Boston the social worlds of the white and black population have significance by impressively incomplete contact with each other. Therefore, they have partial and sometimes distorted information about each other. This promotes a tendency on the part of one group to think in stereotyped ways about the other. In a sense it is psychologically economical since it maintains a simple uncluttered notion. But it is based on insufficient data and promotes the continuance of one group viewing another on the basis of generalizations rather than on the basis of

reality.

It is precisely in this area where schools can play an important role, especially if they are assisted by a mental health team.

It may have been a mistake for such courses as black history to be primarily limited to black students as it was in some schools. Although it played an important role in increasing the identity of the black students, it did nothing to decrease the information gap of many of the white students.

Mental health workers can help to classify educational functions which are needed to reduce the information gap as emergency measures in order to deal with this particular cause of racist disease--information deficit.

Two factors tend to perpetuate stereotyped ideas about groups. One factor we can call the self-fulfilling prophecy. This pertains to a person who has a fixed idea about another person, e.g., that the person may be overtly aggressive, and he then begins to behave in a way that elicits the aggressive behavior.

The second factor is that of a reference group which provides a person with social and interpersonal standards by which he judges himself. The reference group is usually a community of peers but it may be some other group to which a person attributes a high value, e.g., a power-holding majority. If one has only fragmentary contact with the reference group he would only have partial knowledge of that group's standards. Therefore the person's behavior may be a caricature of what the members of the dominant group regard as desirable. This behavior would then tend to reinforce their prejudicial stereotyped ways of perceiving the outgroup that the person represents.

There is no question that black citizens have begun to abandon the goal of emulating the dominant culture. This has great benefits for their development but, as will be pointed out in other sections, it may actually lead to increasing distress in members of the dominant culture.

A sense of identity is an antidote to low self esteem engendered by dominant group discrimination. This is very crucial in transforming a minority from a group bound together only by awareness of common misery into a group which is committed to action on the basis of shared goals.

5. Some Charactersitics of the Prejudiced Person

Bigoted individuals suffer from impaired reality testing. This

can be active information selection and/or modification of incoming information that threatens a key belief or attitude. One has to view much of the reaction of residents of South Boston in this way. It is extremely difficult but not impossible to provide corrective information to these individuals in a normal way. But merely presenting corrective information in a rational and reasonable way may have no effect or have a negative effect. In fact, some individuals confronted with a reality incompatible with their beliefs deal with it as an exception. In some cases prejudice is like an obsession, closely connected with unconscious irrational needs; rational modification efforts will be unsuccessful, and one may have to address the conflict or the need with which it is connected.

Of course, many other factors are involved in prejudice besides the psychological, such as the social and political discussed earlier. However, the fact that many factors are involved does not mean that we exclude the specific psychological meaning that prejudicial attitudes have in some individuals. One can often identify sexual and aggressive impulses of a person which cause conflict or guilt and which are projected to a target group.

A study by Adorno indicated that persons who had strong prejudice and bigoted ideas are often authoritarian personalities. These persons frequently show the following characteristics:

--sensitivity to interpersonal status

--dependence on conventional values

--uncritical submission to a dominant group authority

--punitive behavior to people who violate the group code

--inflexibility of organized beliefs about reality

In contrast, people who are open-minded and able to receive, evaluate and act on relevant information which they receive from the outside are least likely to be prejudiced.

A recent study noted that less prejudiced people were much more able to be openly critical of their parents. On psychological tests they showed much less evidence of projected hostility. More prejudiced individuals were much less critical of parents, authority, or loved ones but on tests showed much more hostility in stories they told. They were much more likely to be hostile to other groups which, in a sense, represents a projection just as their response to tests is a projection. Does this mean if one were able to deal with their hostility and ambivalence they would be less likely to be prejudiced?

There are a variety of unconscious determinants in racist attitudes, such as repression or lack of awareness that one might be using

racist technique (as cited by Ordway). The fact that this is out-of-awareness not only blinds members of the dominant culture to the knowledge that such mechanisms exist, it also permits prejudicial attitudes to exist and to be repeated daily without the individual being confronted with the racist nature of his behavior. It is important to realize how illogical and how unsound it is to assume that an individual in our culture could be free of many of the culturally determined racist attitudes which exist.

It is essential to understand that active desegregation in many white communities threatens the basic superior-inferior relationship which many whites have perceived all their life between blacks and whites. In other words it is a threat to the established order of things. It is a struggle which for some has the feeling of a struggle for their basic rights. It may not be correct, it may be an inaccurate perception of reality but this is the way it feels to a large number of individuals.

6. Consequences of Discrimination and Some Approaches to Modify

One must always wonder what the effect is of being told that you are inferior, dangerous, hated, obnoxious, or unwanted. For this reason it is important to allow the child in a busing situation to say what he is feeling. If the child you are dealing with does experience this, it is important to let him talk about it. You must avoid creating the expectation in the child that it is wrong for him to feel afraid, sad, intimidated, because we now know that blacks are not inferior. Intellectually the child may know this but he still feels hurt. It is important for the child to know that one may be hurt but that doesn't mean that they are defeated. Therefore, one should not try and convince the child he doesn't feel something and should try to help him to realize that he doesn't have to feel it and that the reality people are trying to impose upon him is untrue but that having all this anger and fear directed at one is hurtful.

One must therefore be careful not to block the child's communication. This is a special danger if you want the child to feel certain ways. Find out how they feel and not what you feel or want them to feel.

It is extremely important to get the parents involved as much as possible in any kind of work that one does with the children during school crises. It is essential that the discrimination experienced by the child not lead them to feel disappointed with their parents for having allowed this situation to occur and this will help the child avoid seeing his parents as insecure or anxious and, most important, not seeing them as impotent in the face of social reality.

Other reactions frequently occur of which one must be aware. The most natural is that of retaliative hostility against the oppressor. This may take the form of defending oneself, or it may take the form of

attacking, or it may be directed at one's own group. Another reaction is that some individuals resign themselves and become apathetic and give up. Others begin to feel self hate. One frequently sees this self hate in persons whose family have adopted many of the values of a racist society.

There are two protective and problem-solving assets for persons or groups in a situation like the one created during busing. One is education and the second is membership in an on-going viable culture which provides a person with a broader repertoire of problem-solving techniques.

Since racism is multi-determined we must not over-simplify its causes or its solutions. We must also keep in mind that the discriminatory behavior can be modified even while prejudiced feelings may still remain.

An example of this is that whites who would never do so otherwise live next to blacks while working on government jobs or feel comradeship and security with black buddies during war. What this indicates is that the particular setting in which people relate can influence behavior in spite of the fact that internal personal values might lead one to expect somebody is or could be a racist. Everybody could potentially be a racist but, in certain environments, values, motives and impulses can be inhibited while others are facilitated. This is particularly true of people who are strongly influenced by authority, since they are the most likely to be prejudiced. But they are also the individuals who could be most strongly influenced by powerful social and government figures.

Racism affects children in our society in a variety of ways. Dr. Spurlock points out that the problem is not merely one with black children, since racism may have a disastrous effect on the development of white children, particularly adolescents when they identify the charitable, liberal attitudes of many of their parents as actually re-enforcing racist attitudes. A central point is that racism affects all children.

One interesting study described by Dr. Powell utilized a number of scales to determine the effects of racism on self image. One of the most striking findings was that black students in a southern city scored higher on total positive self concept scores than white students in the same city. It was felt that this indicated that black students had a greater sense of certainty about themselves. However, in northern cities, black students did less well than white students. One hypothesis presented was that in the south because of overt racism, a black was able to define himself at an earlier age and develop a more substantial coping style. It has also been postulated that the winds of change may have blown harder in the south so that black people assumed more control over their communities. The importance of this may be that if one knows what to expect, one can determine what realisti-

cally to strive for.

The previous comments are related to the push for reform in the schools not only as an educational strategy but as a mental health strategy. In regard to this, a major problem is found to occur in many white teachers who have a double standard of expectation. This is one of the clearest reflections of the pervasiveness of the influence of racism (which occurs in both black and white teachers). The problem is reflected in so-called special education classes. These have been developed to help students who are disadvantaged. Unfortunately they may have a racist effect even if these were not established with the conscious intent of perpetuating a bias. Reinforcement of a child's feelings about being culturally disadvantaged and deprived could be associated with the child experiencing himself as inferior.

All too frequently teachers in the black ghetto do not expect black children to achieve at the level of white children. This may be just as racist (or at least be doing just as much harm to black people) as a field full of southern farmers in white sheets. Teachers' expectations about the performance of minority children can serve as self-fulfilling prophecy. It is particularly note-worthy how few teachers blame the school for the students' problems. It is also clear that a child's performance can be altered if the teacher's expectation is changed.

In relation to this, there are a few points in the methodology for working with the schools. One key to working with the school is that you must develop a good working relationship with the students, teachers and the school administration. They must not feel suspicious that the mental health team is trying to uncover unconscious impulses or identify sickness. The collaborations should be based on a task orientation. One has to define what it is that the team's efforts are aimed at. One must reduce the anxiety, the self-blame, the feeling of failure and frustration which is so often experienced when confronted with someone from the mental health field. Once these feelings are experienced the individual is likely to become resistant.

One has to help administrators deal with the students. If possible the administrators should see confrontations as useful and not deal with them by reacting in a wounded, angry, or authoritarian way. Rather they should use confrontations as a basis for rational collaboration with the students. Perhaps the important point is to try and focus on the problem of the system and not have a mental team focus on the pathology of individuals.

7. The Questions of Crisis Intervention and the School Problem

This last section briefly reviews the concept of crises and of

crisis intervention. This may be of some importance in organizing one's thoughts, since the current situation has been identified as a crisis. If we talk about it as a crisis then we should at least try and define it. The dictionary says that a crisis is a decisive or vitally important stage in the course of anything. Another definition is that when a sudden or major change involving social roles is noted a crisis may ensue. Social role relates to society's expectation that an individual carries out roles in relationship to the social group.

A significant emotional hazzard can trigger a crisis, according to Caplin. He further states that crisis is provoked when a person faces an obstacle to important life goals that is, for a time, insurmountable to the usual customary methods of problem solving.

The definition given by Thomas in 1909 of crisis is that it is a threat, challenge, or strain on attention, a call for new action in personal and social development. He states that crisis can be a catalyst disturbing old habits, evoking new responses and becoming a factor in charting new development.

A distinctive element of a crisis in all these different definitions is that it represents a sudden change in a person's relationship to others, because of a change in physical, psychological or social status as well as a change in a person's image of himself.

One must be careful not to attribute the current crisis only to the school or to other groups. In part, the crisis can be a function of how individuals perceive their own role in community or family. The changes associated with crisis disrupt old relationships and often make old behavior patterns inappropriate. This leaves a person with a temporary loss of direction. Since one feels at a loss and since old behavior patterns are disrupted, the resistance to change decreases. This makes people more susceptible to influence from the outside which may mean they turn to others for external support. This could be good or bad depending on the authority who is able to influence the person, i.e., the outside supporting figure who is able to impose views. In terms of mental health team work with students who are involved in crisis, one has to be careful not to organize the students', administrators', or teachers' thinking based on what the mental health team member feels is most useful. The team should make every effort to help the student or teacher better organize their own thinking and develop more constructive solutions.

Stages of Crisis

Caplin talks about four phases of crisis:

1. The phase of impact where there is an initial rise in tension which calls for habitual problem-solving responses. A person may be in a state of dazed shock and one may see fight or flight; disoriented or destructive responses.

2. The second stage is increased turmoil; a further rise in tension, and a condition of ineffectiveness and uncertainty associated with a flood of emotion such as rage, guilt, and anxiety.

3. The third stage is a further rise in tension with a mobilization of internal and external resources. The environment is explored for new opportunities to try to reconstruct a new world of activities (certain old goals are given up).

4. The fourth stage is either a breaking down of personality organization or a stage of growth with improved function.

Principles of Crisis Intervention

There are many ways of formulating the principles of crisis intervention and only a few comments will be mentioned in this section.

In terms of current efforts in which the mental health center teams will be involved, a major focus of the work with students or school authorities should be on the current crisis itself and not on life-long psychological phenomena of the individual (since the goal is to achieve optimal crisis resolution).

Another principle is associated with the realization that the crisis represents a danger, as well as an opportunity, if the crisis leads to some adaptive problem. If the crisis has led to disturbed relationships, these must be identified and communicated. One must be careful that the individual involved in the crisis sees his own reaction. Therefore the mental health team must be careful not to impose judgements of and reactions to the crisis. They must be especially careful not to impose their values on crisis participants or to assume that these values are those of the participant.

The object of crisis intervention is to help the individual obtain a better level of adaptation and function in terms of current situation and his value system.

Any kind of crisis intervention is aimed at improving the relationship of individuals in the world in which they live (more specifically, individuals within their own immediate community). The obvious target of crisis intervention must be improvement of the solidarity of the group with which the individual is specifically identified. The longer range goal is, of course, to improve

the relationship between the groups who have an adversary relationship.

In crisis work such as that which is anticipated, a team rather than individual approach must be utilized. However, one aspect of this approach is that it places some people who usually play leadership roles in the activities of the health care system in an untraditional relationship on a crisis team. The reason for this is that the focus must be on disequilibrium in the social system and how it affects the individual. Most health staff are used to focusing on individual disequilibrium and not disturbance in the social system, and most traditional techniques of mental health workers--such as customary intake procedures--are too cumbersome in a crisis. One needs a special team, a different set of guidelines and new roles, to utilize people most effectively to carry out the task of crisis intervention. The staff must be mobile and the leadership cannot be based on traditional roles.

One must be careful, however, not to neglect the special needs of some individual students, teachers, or parents who may require more formal individual counseling and therapy, since not everything that one sees in an individual may be attributable to the crisis.

The key function in crisis intervention is a preventive one. Lindemann felt that whenever possible, the major effort in a crisis should be to help individuals develop techniques in advance to deal with an expected crisis. This raises the whole question of rehearsal. Rehearsal of some sort would be provided with the hope of helping individuals avoid distress when confronted with uncertain real situations. One has to be extremely careful not to create a set so individuals react in a way that you shape even if the situation which is expected does not occur.

This introduces the whole topic of crisis preparation which can be divided into several sub-topics:

1. Cognitive crisis preparation. This refers to the presentation of factual material to the person.

2. Emotional crisis preparation refers to allowing a person to be exposed to a situation that can be overcome by providing an experience of anticipatory guidance. This raises a whole question of the utilization of mini-confrontations for students, parents, teachers, teams and the police. These mini-confrontations might give people a chance to expand their behavior repertoire. What would be included in these kinds of situations would be the exposure to increasingly stressful experiences so that a person can learn to be successful in handling many of these experiences. This has to do with the whole question of whether one can inoculate an individual to stress.

The key for the teams working in this area and the people in-

volved in the crisis may be to be able to practice techniques which are effective in dealing with the types of stress to which they will be exposed. This would help build self-confidence and esteem in dealing with the crisis and it would decrease the likelihood of loss of control or loss of hope.

Other steps which need to be considered are to be sure to identify the events which are actually causing the individual's problem and not the events which you think are likely to cause the problem. Don't assume you know. In addition to identifying events you must understand the meaning of the events to the individual. Further, it is useful to formulate the dynamics of the current crisis to the groups as well as to the individual. However, always check to be sure that what is in your mind is what is in the mind of the individuals you are trying to help.

The cognitive aspect has to do with communicating an understanding of the crisis to the person in language that they understand. The goal is not to resolve longstanding individual or social problems but to understand the meaning of the current situation and the new choices available to cope with changed reality. Military experience is a useful guide: during World War II (and later wars) it was learned that one could treat combat crisis reactions very effectively if the individual felt secure and dependent upon a group, such as a squad, platoon, or company. The more a group is able to support an individual, the greater is their resistance to stress. The key for people in a combat situation, as well as people exposed to the kinds of crisis we are concerned with, is a readiness in terms of what to expect. If one knows what to expect then one can rehearse. This ability to be prepared, to anticipate, and to rehearse,in addition to feeling the protection of a group with similar values helps people overcome the effects of external and environmental stress and crisis.

In attempting to help, you should make an effort to provide people with what they ask for and not what you would like to do. Help them on the basis of their reaction and not yours. In many instances it may be that the student is less disturbed than the mental health worker with a particular situation. Further, it is also important not to let one's socially determined expectation get in the way of perceiving accurately what help an individual student may want. It would be wise for the members of the mental health team to have an opportunity to rehearse their responses to a variety of situations.

The problems with which we have been dealing in this paper are all related to the theme from the 1967 Kerner Report:

> The broad problem is that racial stereotypes are part of America's world. Whites grow up with them and they need not feel guilty or revengeful about admitting it. Racism

> is so deeply rooted in our society that it will require new attitudes, new understandings, new will and a new tolerance from every American black, as well as white, to overcome it. If not, America will continue upon its disastrous drift into two societies, separate, perhaps equal, but locked in strife.

It is certainly clear that no one should be surprised that racism exists. Of course in the mental health area there is a great deal of denial of the continued evidence for its presence. All persons working in the mental health area must be aware of the fact that what we seem to need to do is identify without apologies or defensiveness the areas in which it does exist and then try and influence the behavior of individuals and the policies of institutions. But we have all been taught, both formally and informally, in racist ways. Therefore, it is really rather difficult to understand how any individual, black or white, can be free of these attitudes. It may take considerable effort to break down the denial of many of these firmly embedded sets and views. We may not like the fact that these things exist, but the fact they do exist should mobilize us to take action to modify and change them.

If the mental health teams working in school crises are effective in any way in reducing the epidemic of the racist plague in American cities, it might be a step in eradicating the disease itself.

"THE ISSUE IS US"

by Senator George McGovern (D.-S.D.)

Remarks made before the National Democratic Issues Convention in Louisville, Kentucky, on Sunday, November 23, 1975.

In certain places and times, political leaders must talk with the people of things which they might prefer to whisper only among themselves. I believe this city is such a place; this weekend is such a time; that here and now, honest and fundamental things must be said about civil rights, in particular the problem of busing.

I did not decide to give this speech because I desire to be unpopular, or because I dislike applause, or without reflecting on both the dangers of saying anything today, and our duty to say something, about the busing issue. I do not expect all of you to agree with my view or with my decision even to take a position during this conference. I ask only that before you make your judgement, you hear me out and think about the reasons which compel me to accent and assert some difficult conclusions. I believe we must state our case responsibly instead of rationalizing reasons for a political reason to evade the questions. Our opponents will not permit us to evade it--even if the people would.

As a Senator from South Dakota, I have not felt the full intensity of the anti-busing reaction. But as a candidate for President in 1972, I had to confront the issue and my conscience. I earnestly sought an alternative to busing which would achieve a similar degree of integration and a better level of education. I found that in many cases the only alternative was segregation and bad education. I made a commitment to myself not to exploit or equivocate on busing during that campaign.

So I came to this occasion with a sharp sense of the anguish there is in the word and the reality of busing. But I do not apologize for attempting to respond in a way which I conceive to be both sensible and essential. For even if we do not address the question, others will continue to exploit it. Even if we are shy, they will be shrill. They will offer false hope and deepen the shadows of fear.

Our silence on busing consents only to a longer state of crisis and uncertainty. The sounds of our silence abandon the public dialogue to demagoguery, to be twisted and enflamed. If telling the truth is a promise to be kept rather than a slogan to be broken, then we must speak

of busing openly and plainly, even and especially in Louisville, where it is the issue.

Twelve years ago yesterday, John Kennedy was struck down. Those who wrote his epitaph said that perhaps history would most honor him because what he asked us to do for our country was the undone work of civil rights.

Ten years ago last summer, Lyndon Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act. Those who measured the moment said it would be remembered as the worthiest deed of that Democratic President and Congress.

In those days of oppression and liberation, of Bull Connor and Martin Luther King, of church bombings and freedom rides, it was a prideful thing for the Democratic Party to call itself the party of civil rights. We pledged then to overcome the barriers of segregation. But we pause now at the higher threshold of integration, torn between the apparent expediencies of politics and the clear demands of conscience. At the mention of busing, we raise a collective index finger to our lips, closing off the discussion of a constitutional mandate which we cannot bring ourselves to deny. How sad it is to feel that first we have to take some time to justify even speaking on civil rights at all.

Now we must resume the duty of our party, which is the need of our nation. We must reclaim the burden--and the glory--of leadership on this issue which will not pass away. A major issues conference must discuss more than easy issues, economic issues, and fashionable issues--everything in short except the transcendent moral issue of three centuries on this continent. A major issues conference in Louisville must face this major issue, not of Louisville alone, but of Boston, and of other places across the land.

That issue is not whether children should be bused to school. Forty percent of all the pupils in American public schools ride a school bus each day. Only five percent of them are bused for the purpose of desegregation. Indeed for generations, black and white students were transported past each other's schools--and before the invention of buses, the segregationists used buckboards.

The issue is not the method of transportation, but the reason for it. Or in the words of the Reverend Jesse Jackson, "The issue is not the bus; the issue is us." The issue <u>is</u> all of us Americans, and the evil we have done to each other, and how it must be undone. Where the law and public authority were misused to separate the races, and where no other means will secure the equality of integration, then under the Constitution some vehicle must be selected to move black and white children to the same schools. Buses happen to be safer than bicycles and cheaper than helicopters.

I know that busing is an inconvenient device, that neighborhood

schools are an important value, that most suburbs are exempted while many children in the central cities are expected to board the buses. I believe the duty of desegregation should be distributed more fairly. But I also understand that no matter what we say or where we search, we will not find an easy means to alter hardened patterns of discrimination and apply the higher principles of a common citizenship.

Before we speak too glibly of "forced busing," we should remember that busing is not the only thing which is forced. Black families do not volunteer to make their homes in slum housing. Black children do not volunteer to be bitten by rats. Older blacks do not voluntarily walk on unsafe streets. Black workers are not voluntarily underpaid and unemployed in disproportionate numbers.

So it has been from the beginning of America; unlike nearly all the rest of us or our forebears, black people did not even come voluntarily to this land. They did not volunteer to be sold into slavery or emancipated into the serfdom of tenant farming and subsistence labor. What of the forced lashings and the forced lynchings and the malignant neglect of forced hunger and helplessness--all of which came before busing?

For all of our history, the black human beings among us have been forced into another, lesser country--and millions of them are still confined in that other America, learning and earning too little, falling sick too often and dying too soon, and foreseeing for their children only the same grim and hopeless half-life.

In many cities, South and North, local governments have forced busing upon their own citizens by enforcing the segregation of public schools. That was what happened here in Louisville. And in Boston, the School Committee practiced a pervasive discrimination for years prior to the busing order.

The Federal Government itself reinforced the residential segregation which has prevented integrated schools in integrated neighborhoods. The Federal Housing Administration, the largest single source of home financing, recommended from its inception that restrictive covenants be kept and that multi-racial areas be rated at less than fair market value. Intentionally and systematically, by the power of law and the effect of public policy, we imposed apartheid in America; we South Africanized the workings and institutions of our society.

Now for more than two decades we have been engaged in a struggle to lift the heavy burdens of this oppression. In 1954 the Supreme Court conformed the Constitution to a higher law and ruled that the doctrine of separate but equal had no place in public education. Since then we have proclaimed that it has no place anywhere in American law or life--that people who are artificially separated are not and cannot be equally treated.

That is the heart of the matter, the substance of our choice. Integration is the issue: whether America will live a lie or make it true that we are one country, with one tax system, and one defense system, and one school system--with one liberty and one justice for all citizens of any race. Do we really pledge allegiance to one flag or one nation indivisible, or will we keep our society in torment and turmoil, divided against itself? Is integration something we applaud only when we watch O.J. Simpson carry the ball?

Recently we heard that busing itself has proved the impracticality of school integration. Research was cited to argue that desegregation in the cities multiplies the flight to white suburbs. But now we are finding from new research that a small increase of "white flight" occurs only for a single year.

Perhaps the desire to flee is a product of fearing the worst and this fear is calmed by the better and bearable reality of integration. We always hear of the disruptions and tensions at the beginning of busing; but in cities like Denver and Jacksonville and Pontiac, Michigan, the shouting and the tumult have faded, the television cameras have been turned off, candidates have stopped running against busing and children have started learning together.

In Charlotte, North Carolina, where an historic busing order was issued by the courts, the schools are now integrated; the expensive private schools are closing; nearly everyone agrees that the quality of education has improved; and the city--black and white--is at peace. Recently parents in Charlotte who at first had opposed busing invited a delegation from Boston to visit and see how well busing has worked in their city. So it is in many other communities, although such quiet observances of the law may not attract the media or our attention.

Instead there seems to be a busing opposition in search of an argument. As each argument must be discarded, the next one will do. And for each campaign season, there seems to be another substitute for busing--a slogan or a concept which lacks only three things: any proof of its effect, any estimate of its cost, or any plan to pay for it.

We have heard about magnet schools, educational parks, different attendance zones and school construction shifts. But the question is whether these are rhetorical tricks or real alternatives. Politicians who offer any of these measures as an alternative should be willing to present a plan of implementation. And they should be ready to prove the sincerity of their purpose by providing that busing will be phased out only to the extent that their program in fact promotes integration.

We have also heard about one-way busing. Now those who have talked about it should explain how to replace all our inner city

schools with sufficient space and classrooms in other neighborhoods and the suburbs. Millions of children would have to be transferred; thousands of school buildings would have to be closed; tens of billions of dollars would have to be spent to build new ones. Who would pay the higher taxes, and how much higher would they be? And there are those who say that school integration should come naturally, as part of the process of residential integration. But that process is working in reverse: today our cities are more segregated than they were a decade ago. So if the answer is the integration of housing, then let us have the plan and follow it--and then fewer children of any race will be bused because more children of both races will walk to the same neighborhood schools.

Thus we are brought back to the basic questions:

Do we want integration or segregation?

If busing is the wrong answer, what is the right answer?

What substitute will integrate the schools, and how, and and when, and at what cost?

Busing is one way to pay the bill for the ancient regime of racism. There may be other ways, but none of them will be painless or priceless. Indeed if we abandoned the goal of integration, if we tried to be separate but equal, we would have to reduce spending for each student in the suburbs--or we would have to raise those who now have the least to the level of the most expensive public education. I have heard the rhetoric of "quality education" many times; I have never seen an appropriation to make it a meaningful reality for every student in America.

So, in a material as well as a moral sense, separation is inherently unequal. The minority who are poor will never be equal if they must always depend upon the charity of a superior majority. That sort of benevolence is a form of tyranny. But when black and white study together in classrooms, they must strive together, each for their own sake, to improve the education of all. Only integration promises a more nearly equal financing regardless of race or economic circumstance.

Many parents say and mean that they object not to busing itself, but to the lesser schools which are at the end of the bus ride. But if these schools are unfit for their children, then they are also unequal and unacceptable for black daughters and sons. Opposition to busing is not necessarily racist, but the cause of busing is deeply rooted in historic racism. There is only one answer: we must move beyond that racism and the negativism of being against busing to a positive commitment to both the integration and the improvement of the entire system of schools. At the end of every child's walk or ride, there should be a good school, a safe school, an open school, and the

highest possible standard of education.

Some may reply that this is all well and good, but it is also politics--that if we keep our conscience, the Republicans will keep the presidency. But the final and the consoling truth of busing is that on this issue fewer of the people will be fooled another time. More of them now understand that any candidate who says or implies that by supporting him the voters can stop the buses will prove as President to be either a liar or a violator of the Constitution. Twice they heard the deceptions of Nixon and both times his victory was followed by more busing, not less. Does an angry parent feel better because a President a thousand miles away also feels bad about busing--or because he berates the courts while the buses roll?

A Governor cannot stop the buses--and more of the people now understand that. The voters of Florida overwhelmingly re-elected Reubin Askew even though he upheld the courts on busing. The Republican candidate in Kentucky rode the anti-busing issue this fall--straight down to defeat.

A President cannot stop the buses--and more of the people now understand that. A presidential candidate recently said that he would not mention busing in the Massachusetts Primary because the voters already know where he stands. But many of them also know that on busing it does not matter who sits in the White House.

Busing is not a presidiential prerogative to impose or repeal. It is one inescapable remedy of the Constitution for a proven case of segregation of the schools.

It is no answer to call for busing only as a last resort, for that is already the rule of the law. The courts now decree busing only where other means would be ineffective.

It is no answer to be reluctantly for busing in some places--except where the next speech is to be given. For it is a lie to leave Louisville with the impression that if we had our way and our victory the buses would be driven away.

There is one last answer to which few leaders of the national Democratic Party have yielded, to which even Nixon did not bow, and which Congress will never pass. It is to change the American Constitution to outlaw busing. Even many in the Senate and the House who oppose busing will not support this. They will not write the inequality of separated races into the greatest plan for free government in the history of the human race. A document which began with the pledge of a more perfect union shall not become a means to perfect the disunion of America.

That is the question, whether the word is busing or desegregation. It may be the most fateful issue of our time as it has been

a fundamental issue through all the time of our history. Today no less than during the Civil War, the treatment of races reaches that spiritual depth which is at the ground of our national being. It is a more important measure of America than the gross national product. It affects our national security more than the number of our missiles and the size of our bombs. It counts more than how we are doing materially, but whether America has a meaning beyond mere existence. And in the end, in ways which we may not yet foresee, in a turmoil yet to come, in a fire next time, the flaw of racism may bring down all the rest and the best work of our lives. We cannot permanently endure as a separated minority and a more than equal majority. Every segregated ghetto, every defiance of the law, and every instance of impoverished education wounds and weakens the body politic of America.

I have discussed the questions of busing today because I want to see a day when this becomes the kind of just and good society where busing will not have to be an answer. If the Democratic Party can stand firm now on the issues which divide us--black from white--the impoverished from the employed--and New York City from the rest of the nation, then we may be able at last to fulfill the larger interests which unite us: sufficient jobs for all our workers, fair returns for all our farmers, reasonable profits for all our merchants, and open neighborhoods for all our people. In that state of the nation, there will be no longer a need or a crisis of busing; and we will have started to tame the cuases of crime and violence.

For ten years many of us were told to temper the truth of our opposition to the Vietnam War. But that terrible war nearly took the soul of America, and we had to take our stand. Now I do not want a great political party which nearly lost its soul in Vietnam to sell its soul on busing.

So I believe that in this election the Democratic Party must make and keep these resolutions:

> That we shall not join the naive or cynical anti-idealist in an unrealistic pledge to prevent the busing of students and the integration of schools.
>
> That we shall never consent to a constitutional amendment which would be a Bill of Wrongs for the unwhite and the unwealthy.
>
> That we shall hold to the most solemn of our covenants--that we shall overcome.
>
> And that we shall not nominate for the presidency a person who even before he takes it has perjured the oath of that office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

All of us should warn any candidate who turns to the tactics of racial division and fear that in conscience we cannot support him even if he is the nominee.

We did not choose this issue. It came to us Americans along with the blessings of our heritage as the greatest burden of our history. We cannot hide from it, or lie about it, or postpone it or pretend that we do not hear or see. In this party, in this country, in this generation and this campaign, we must seek and speak the truth of civil rights. Then our children and their children after them, whatever their color or class, will sing together in school with a fuller meaning than ever before:

> "America, America, God shed His grace on thee
> And crown thy good with brotherhood
> From sea to shining sea."

OFFENSIVE MECHANISMS

Chester M. Pierce, M.D.
Professor of Education
Harvard University

A chapter from The Black Seventies, edited by Floyd Barbour, Porter Sargeant Publishers, Boston, Massachusetts.

Racism

Racism in the United States is a public health and mental health illness. It is a mental disease because it is delusional. That is, it is a false belief, born of morbidity, refractory to change when contrary evidence is presented concerning the innate inferiority of any person with dark skin color. Thus everyone in this country is inculcated with a barrage of sanctions which permit and encourage any white to have attitudes and behavior indicative of superiority over any black. Since everyone is involved in this delusion, then by definition it is a public health problem. The extent of the public health involvement is judged in terms of other definitions of a public health illness. In the classical mode of such illnesses, racism, besides affecting masses of populations, also defies therapy on a one-to-one basis, produces chronic sustained disability, and requires large sums of money to eradicate.

There are still other dimensions to the medical description of racism. It is a contagious disease. There may not exist a white or black man in this country who has never had to operate from one side or the other of a line drawn against the black man. For the black man to violate this line, often legally drawn, is to invite the most sinister and ultimate catastrophe; while the white man, even the most indefatigable, non-conforming liberal, is liable to have to take advantage of racial prerogative to the detrimental exploitation of some hapless--if unseen-- black. Who has not known of relatively immune places such as small Scandinavian villages which seemed relatively bereft of negative racial attitudes until the arrival of a contingent of vociferous, outraged white Americans?

Yet another medical aspect of racism is the fact that it is a perceptual illness. In almost any black-white negotiation each participant views things differently, depending on whether he is white (the offender) or black (the offended). For instance, the psychological hallmark of racism is the altogether too well-known tendency for whites to congratulate themselves, before a black, concerning what marvelous

"progress" is being made. To the perception of the white offender, this is true and reasonable. From the vantage point of the black offended, however, this is both untrue and unreasonable. If the black offended then indicates in any manner whatsoever that he is not convinced that congratulations are in order, he is gruffly perceived as at best an ingrate or at worst an ignoramus who refuses to comply with the rules set up by his oppressor. This sparks white animosity and hostility. In turn, the poorly understood black is goaded to counter-hostility. It is in this way that the micro-aggressions of offensive maneuvers can accumulate and build to explosive white violence and retaliative black counter-violence.

Offensive mechanisms serve in other ways as a vehicle for the micro-aggressive episodes that make up racism. One of the most grisly of these considerations involves the fact that racism is a lethal disease. The offensive mechanisms which assure that the person in the inferior status is ignored, tyrannized, terrorized, and minimized constitute the fabric from which is cut the cloth of statistics that describe the plight of the ghetto citizen. It is a summation of collective micro-offenses by the majority that ignores the fact that a massive commitment is needed to make the ghetto school fail. Up until now, the education system has succeeded in preparing generation after generation of blacks to accept the docile, passive positions of abused, disenfranchised, second-class citizens.

It is a summation of collective micro-offenses by the majority that permits police department after police department to tyrannize black communities. It is a summation of collective micro-offenses by the whites which applies economic terrors to poor blacks who have the temerity to demand what the law provides. It is a summation of collective micro-offenses by the whites to minimize the social importance of any black, or any black achievement, so that blacks will see themselves as useless, unlovable, unable.

These are the sorts of micro-offenses that lead to the statistical early demise of blacks and to their incomparably higher morbidity and mortality rates. In the psychology perceptions of the black, such deaths are calculated murders by the white offender whose ever-growing collective micro-aggressions presage more slaughter and even more repression. It is difficult, if not impossible, for a black to understand how a white, particularly a privileged white, can exhibit offensive micro-aggressions without considering himself a murderer. It is axiomatic that the more privileges a person enjoys, the more responsibility he should bear to eliminate the process of offensive micro-aggressions from the confines of his own institutions. It is not the janitor in the hospital who determines the process interactions between black and white; it is the hospital director and the board of trustees and the senior staff.

So much for a psychological fraction of truth about racism as viewed by a black psychiatrist. Racism is a mental health and public

health disease characterized by perceptual distortion, contagion, and fatality. The vehicle for these characteristics is the cumulative effect of offensive mechanisms, individually exhibited but collectively approved and promoted by the white sector of this society. I turn now to a more refined description of offensive behavior.

Offensive Behavior

There would be many areas from which a theoretician could command literature to help him understand offensive behavior. For example, one could study the extreme aggressive act, homicide. Or one could look to animal studies, particularly the social behavior of animals. Another route would be to examine what is known about the relationship of endocrine glands to aggression. In political science there is an abundance of information on political conflict and the accession to power of influence. All these sources are illuminated when placed in conjunction with the psychoanalytic literature on aggression, particularly studies on psychosexual development. Nowadays, a student of aggression would have to search for the aggressive component in high school radicalism or campus disorders. Field studies and laboratories (such as those on men living in exotic-stressful environments) are still another source of information about aggression.

To prepare for this article, I felt it of greater importance, however, to observe at first hand how someone is trained deliberately to be offensive. One could elect to observe the training of warriors, for example. I did elect to observe the training of a class of warriors who are in an on-going preparation to be offensively efficient.

Accordingly, I worked recently as an assistant line coach of the Harvard freshman football team. I had gone to the task with a set of expectations about offensive behavior. Pithy details, like how many feet an end cheated on in order to tighten the defense, occupied my keenest interest. Mundane facts, like whether one uses an inside or outside shoulder block in a given instance, taught me how complicated it is to conduct a good offense. Often I marvelled at the marked improvement to the offense that would accrue from a small change like replacing a brush block with a reserve body block.

Soon I was able to assemble those features of a successful offense that were applicable to both the football warrior-in-training and the school-boy bigot-in-training. Just as the skillful coach teaches his charges certain rules about the offense, society is unrelenting in teaching its white youth how to maximize the advantages of being on the offense toward blacks.

It is the offense that selects the site of action for the

scrimmage. This site is selected with great care and attention. With cunning guile and ruthless artfulness, the offense looks for weaknesses in the opponent and then concentrates its full force on that weakness. The aim is to control in order to score. To do this requires deception while carrying out a pattern of plays with the deliberate intention of destroying and demolishing any opponent who chances to present a frustration. Often this guile and deception is most successful when the defense is obliged to accustom itself to your play patterns, since you, the offense, not the defense, know what your final plan will be. In this way, the offense engages craft in the service of forcing the opponent to take himself out of play. There are critical advantages to the offense. These include, besides selecting the site of action, a knowledge of when the play will initiate. Often when this action commences, the best offenders can cheat on the call, so that they are into action, illegally, with such speed and precision that a referee can't disqualify them even if he is suspicious of the action. The emphasis on speed, deception, power, control, and initiative reflects accurately the habitual mode of interchange between whites and blacks. These attributes can be described in terms of specific offensive mechanisms.

In order to make more sense of the offensive mechanisms with attributes of speed, deception, power, control, and initiative, I must first share another insight gleaned from the practice fields, America's laboratory for human relations, where experiments in controlled aggression are usual fare.

One day the coach, a man whom I have admired for a quarter of a century, had me watch a center block and a middle guard during a scrimmage. The coach said he, too, would watch the center and the middle guard in their head-to-head contest. At the end of the play, to my amazement, the coach proceeded to instruct a fullback on what he had done wrong. The fullback was at least eight yards away from the skirmish we had agreed to evaluate. Then the coach lined up his offense and demonstrated with himself at the fullback position what the errant youth had done. Finally, he lined them up again and ran the play properly. The freshman fullback, after this demonstration, was able to resume the position and operate in a satisfactory manner.

Later, I asked the coach how he knew what the fullback had done since we were watching, specifically and intently, what two other boys were doing. I complained that I could hardly tell what those two had done, much less be able to detect a minor error on the fullback's part. He laughed. He said, "All these years you guys thought I had eyes in the back of my head. I didn't. I knew from where the boy was at the end of the play what he must have done. I looked at where he was at, and I knew what must have happened!" This was for me an arresting statement. It defined a professional: one who knew what had to have happened by seeing how it turned out. His intercession defined something else for me. It said that he knew that immediate correction was necessary, easy and useful. By implication,

if such correction was not forthcoming, then this lad would be retarded just a bit in becoming a better offender.

The lesson I learned was that the professional looks at the "end result" of the offensive action and he knows what happened and how it could be made to be a better offensive action, or indeed, if uncorrected, what advantage could go to a shrewd defense. Hence, I decided that one should look to the end of the action of how whites treat blacks to understand what happened. Then one could begin to think about offensive weaknesses which the defense could ferret out.

There are probably many offensive actions that could be delineated in the field of human relations. I will name a few based on what the end result of the action was, and which utilize a particular dynamic attribute. After mentioning a few of these offensive mechanisms which deliver micro-aggressive results to a presumed inferior, I will discuss a possible clinical usage that could be made of the concept of offensive mechanisms.

One must bear in mind that the culture makes offensive mechanisms automatic and perhaps almost obligatory on the part of whites. These mechanisms may be seen as conscious, unconscious, or pre-conscious. But to the black, the salient feature is that offensive mechanisms seem automatic, always available to define for whites the way of inter-personal activities with blacks.

Some Offensive Mechanisms

1. "We love you blacks to death." This mechanism is what the clinician can diagnose when a black man feels and perceives at the end of the offense that the white man has said, "you blacks are unappreciative even though we whites love you to death." The varieties of this common offense include the well-used tokenism in which the visible black is displayed before the world as a demonstration of how loving the white man can be. No black should feel unappreciative if a single black is a secretary in the President's office while the remaining 5000 black employees of the company all remain at the most menial level.

The "pat and promise" is also an offense categorized under loving blacks to death. Here the black is made to feel that the good faith registered by white solicitude is sufficient. To demand more is both outrageous and ridiculous from the perceptual view of the white.

"Fragmentation and atomization" is seen frequently. Every black who is in contact with whites can expect to be called upon for all variety and quality of racial "experiences." Whether he wishes it or not, he is torn apart by a plethora of demands for his time, effort, and attention. These demands are so multitudinous that he is kept from his basic work, whatever it may be,

in the service of helping to assuage white consciences. At the same time the collective whites by this maneuver have diluted and neutralized a possible potent current in the black community. It is essential to the offender that all blacks be divided and claimed by such a multitude of demands that the very number of claims can receive only mediocre and casual attention. If the black rebels against these overtures to fragment and atomize his efforts and strengths, then he, too, can predict long, sorrowful white faces offended by the fact that a black has been unappreciative of their love.

"Pacification" sounds as if it is too passive to be an offensive variety of the love-you-to-death mechanism. However, to make blacks feel they must be pacific, docile, and accepting requires offensive action of the most intense degree. One type of pacification, seen at its best at academic lectures is the "glob on," in which the speaker almost before he can leave the podium is approached and glued-to by avid whites who wish to talk to him. The speed with which this takes place is proto-typical of the attribute most salient in the offensive mechanisms of love-you-to-death. This is the mechanism which depends on blinding speed, once the act is initiated.

All of the offensive mechanisms can occur in overlap, obviously. Some combinations are particularly strong and thus have greater usage by the white offender. The practice field laboratory would predict that a frequent winning combination for the offender is to combine speed with deception. And indeed, in white-black relations this turns out to be the case.

2. "You blacks come see us." This mechanism is what the clinicians can diagnose when a black man feels and perceives at the end of the offense that the white man has said, "come see us, at our site of action and we'll help you, if you beg." The offender maneuvers to be sure that the black feels and acts properly humble and humiliated. The black must be put on the defensive. It is gratifying to the white's ego to have an audience with the beggar and to decide whether or not a crumb can be dispensed. If the offended beggar is not properly chastened, the good offender makes sure that the offended knows that reprisals are readily available; this is done quickly. The very best offenders when using this mechanism know how to make the black believe he, the black, must have all the answers to any and all problems. Yet if the black's plans aren't congruent with what the white had in mind, the white offender seizes action by appealing to some other black or white authority. In this way the offended knows he is dispensable, that he must take the defensive. Since these offensive mechanisms are predicted on the satisfying succor they provide to white's esteem and pride, it is no wonder that when the white uses "you blacks come to see us," that the black must be prepared for an onslaught by deception. It is too gratifying to yeild up the offense too readily. Thus the good offender can, by expert deception, keep the poor black returning to beg for an indefinite time. All the while, he, the white, is enjoying the gratification.

Sometimes at this point in a planned offensive maneuver in football, the speed and deception falter. Here enters the need for raw power, a commodity America has in superabundance!

3. "You blacks are sick." This is the mental offensive mechanism employed by whites when power display is required. At the end of the offensive action, the black feels and perceives that the white has communicated: "You blacks are so sick that we must use all our power to protect you for your own sake." There are obvious parallel usages to the mechanisms which the white American doesn't shrink to use when it is convenient, say in Vietnam or Santo Domingo. To accomplish this offense the offended must be made to feel uncertain, unsure and confused. He is told that he doesn't understand his problem because he is too distorted in his outlook. For example, black men are made to feel masochistic even for accepting the abuse heaped upon them. Never could it be communicated that merely to survive in such a system, to prevail and endure under such duress, defines a resiliency of spirit and an altruistic regard toward protecting one's family as best as one can.

When this offensive mechanism is in the hands of a skilled offender, blacks can predict that power pressures are aimed at keeping blacks distrustful and disunified among themselves, for the offender casts grave doubts to the offended about the potentiality of healthy, effective action from any black source.

Once the offended is in this position the final coup is delivered easily. The black is told: control yourself, your sickness is making you lose your temper. The veiled threat, the hidden but clear message in this sort of interaction is that power might have to be unleashed to keep the black from feeling out of sorts about the treatment he receives. For, if the black gets so sick that he expresses anger, the white must display his terrible force.

Here the recipe for a creative, imaginative offense calls for the offender to mix in one of his favorite staples: control. The offensive coach realizes that you can't rely merely on speed, deception, and power. You must be in a position always to control the ball. That is, you must decide what happens next. The attribute of control is associated with the next offensive mechanism.

4. "We're good to you blacks." Here, at the end of the offensive action, if the play has been well-executed, the white man perceives and feels that he is still in control. The black man feels and perceives that the white has said: "We're good to you blacks and you should be grateful that we control you as gingerly and humanely as we do."

In order to accomplish this objective every white school child must be taught that he knows more than any black, that he knows how to do everything and anything better than a black and that a black really cannot have an essential idea worthy of attention. The educational system both through formal efforts (like per capita input

for students) and informal efforts (like the handling of mass media) must make these ideas functionally true. On the obverse, the black child must be inculcated with his own inadequacies, deficiencies, and helplessness. Only if the school system and mass media actively help to make the black, as well as the white, have these attitudes can the offensive mechanism of "we're good to you blacks" be effective. It is for this reason that the school system and the mass media are the institutions most responsible for initiating and maintaining the folie a deux that characterizes race relations in the United States. (Folie a deux: "double madness"; the presence of the same or similar delusional ideas in two persons closely associated with one another, especially the result of delusional ideas being transmitted from one person to another).

With the white offender backed by the power that comes from his group's economic base and the control that comes to him as a result of the way he deploys his school systems and mass media, it is easy to be good to blacks. The white can dispense largess, he can define what is best for blacks: what they should do, what they should want, what they should not want. Naturally all this takes place without the benefit of black consultation. Or if black consultation is sought it is unthinkable (for no black, by definition of the oppressor's rules, can have a worthy idea) that the black can truly make a contribution concerning what he needs or wants. Whites always presume to tell blacks what it is like to be black.

After the Black Psychiatrists organized some time ago, and I was elected the first national chairman, a white psychoanalyst--a dear friend--spoke to me on the phone. I timed his "lecture" to me. For twenty-one minutes he harangued about such things as what did I know about poverty since I was never really poor (he has never had schizophrenia but it is all right for him to treat schizophrenia!). He told me in essence that my life was not subjected to racial abuse. I cited the most raw abuses to him which he conceded he hadn't imagined (since some took place in his home town). I indicated that as I grew older and into greater access to things, the more sad and angry I became. This was especially true when I saw the way decisions are made. Further, I would never presume to tell him how it is to be white or what he should do. The rules of our society, however, allowed him to tell me, in what must be described as a patronizing lecture, what I should or should not be doing and what was in my own best interest. I presumably should have reacted to such psychotherapeutic intervention by doing what he said, or in essence, by being controlled.

An offensive line coach, the basic science teacher of offensive action, reviewing the interaction just described, would want to know immediately how the offender instituted his play at control. That is, in ball control (which is the name of the game of offense) the critical factors are: Who initiates the action? Where is the action initiated? When is the action initiated? In this latter instance my dear friend, and he is still a dear friend (for I'd have no white acquaintances,

much less friends, if I withdrew every time I was hit by an offensive mechanism) initiated the action at a site and time of his choosing.

This leads us to consider the last of the offensive mechanisms that we shall discuss. It is the one whose attribute is initiative. As such, to the basic scientist of offensive maneuvers, it must be the mechanism which is most dear to his heart. For the basic scientist in his private field laboratory never ceases to insist that by offense is meant who, when, where, and how action is initiated.

5. "We whites are right." This offensive mechanism is the most basic. It is, of course, the one from which spring all the others. And it is one which most directly testifies to the white that he is superior. As discussed previously, the existence of offensive mechanisms stem from the need of whites to reaffirm and reassert feelings and ideas of racial superiority.

At the conclusion of this offensive action, the black man must feel and perceive that the white man has said, "We whites are right, we whites know what we're doing and you blacks are here at our forbearance, for our amusement, entertainment, or other exploitation." I notice in a class I teach that after each session a white, not a black, will come up to me and tell me how the class should be structured or how the chairs should be placed or how there should be extra meetings outside the classroom, etc. The student is on the initiative and sees as his usual prerogative with a black that he must instruct me and order me about and curb my own inclinations and independence. One could argue that I am hypersensitive, if not paranoid, about what must not be an unusual kind of student-faculty dialogue. This I concede. What I cannot explain, but what I know every black will understand, is that it is not what the student says in this dialogue, it is how he approaches me, how he talks to me, how he seems to regard me. I was patronized. I was told, by my own perceptual distortions perhaps, that although I am a full professor on two faculties at a prestigious university, to him I was no more than a big black nigger. I had to be instructed and directed as how to render him more pleasure! Doubtlessly, the students would be aggrieved to think they came across to me like that and might demand an apology. Yet white America has so structured human interactions that if every time in the next day that a black felt something like I felt from a well-intentioned, well-meaning white, we would have to take time out for literally thousands of apologies. The employment of offensive tactics is so inherent, so intrinsic to all interpersonal relations between white and black, that it is inconceivable to me that well into the next century blacks will not be having these angry thoughts. But can use be made of the study of the description and dynamics of offensive mechanisms, the chief means of racial interaction employed by whites in America?

The Clinical Usage of Offensive Mechanisms

Both a basic science specialist, whose laboratory for controlled aggression is a gridiron, and a physician, whose clinical province is all of humankind, are persons who want to know about alternative choices. The football coach spends his life looking for options. The physician spends his life working for treatment possibilities. What are the options or treatment possibilities afforded by a knowledge of offense mechanisms?

Let me start by saying a few words about a program I'm engaged in. Harvard has discarded the traditional Ph.D. program in clinical psychology and replaced it with a new program entitled "Clinical Psychology and Public Practice." This doctoral program is sponsored jointly by four separate faculties (education, medicine, divinity, and arts and sciences). As the name suggests, it is our hope that upon graduation our students will not be private practitioners, but public practitioners. There is the expectation that such public practitioners will function often as change agents within the society. Their chief concern will be with masses of individuals rather than the therapy of one individual by one individual. This concern grows from the conviction that traditional one-to-one models have failed to be of any essential service value to the great bulk of the nation's population. Further, as matters now stand, there is not a great deal of relevancy to the needs of the black poor and perhaps all nonwhite poor in psychiatric teaching programs. The first applications of the idea of offensive mechanisms will be made by students in Clinical Psychology and Public Practice.

Reprinted from: Meyer Weinberg,
Minority Students: A Research Appraisal,
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, National Institute of
Education, March, 1977

CHAPTER 1
THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

The American common school arose on foundations of racial and ethnic exclusivism. This spirit was national rather than sectional, and it guided the behavior of political and community institutions as well. Higher education followed the same path.

For more than a century, minority parents sought to open the schools to their children. They used political and legal means as part of a broader struggle for equal civil and human rights. Only in contemporary times has this effort begun to approach fruition.

Historical perspective clarifies the focus on the present. It reveals both the burden and the promise of the past. Human institutions are only human. They arise in response to definite needs, shift as people change their ways, and make their contemporary appearance in perpetually transitional forms.

A people that gave birth to the world's first system of common schools can hardly be portrayed as passive recipients of their heritage. Today, the challenge is to make the schools truly universal and inclusive. The principal obstacles are institutional, and these institutions bear an historical character in part. These cannot be overcome by being ignored, no matter how clever or sophisticated the evasion.

Black Education Until the Civil War

In 1860, nearly 1.4 million Negro children under 10 years of age lived in the United States. Virtually none attended school.[1] While the school enrollment rate that year was 55 percent for white children, it was slightly less than 2 percent for blacks.[2] Almost all the latter were in the North.

In the South

Beginning with a law passed in 1740 in colonial South Carolina, the slave South enforced a policy of "compulsory ignorance". Under these enactments, it was made a crime to teach slaves to read or write. Frederick Douglass, the time-honored escaped slave and black abolitionist, observed in 1850 when 3.2 million slaves worked in the South, that "there is the greatest unanimity of opinion among the white population of the South in favor of the policy of keeping the slave in ignorance."[3]

About 250,000 free Negroes lived in the South—mostly in border States—in 1860. Few free black children were educated. Less than 4,000 attended public schools. An undetermined number in urban places attended secret schools—taught, for the most part, by whites. Soon after the beginning of the 19th century, many thousand black adults and children learned to read in Sabbath schools. By the 1830's as slaveowner sensitivity to abolitionist doctrine grew, these schools came under suspicion. Instruction in reading was stopped and replaced by oral instruction which stressed memorization. By 1840, only 1,459 blacks were enrolled in 15 Negro Sabbath schools all over the South.[4] Apprenticeship served for a time as another avenue for literacy, as long as masters implemented standard provisions requiring that the apprentice must be taught to read, write, and calculate. In North Carolina, apprenticeship was the dominant means whereby literacy was attained. During the first

third of the century, however, the slave States legislated against such provisions. Specific occupations, such as printing, were closed off to blacks since literacy was required in their practice.[5] A handful of free blacks in Louisiana and Alabama were accorded school rights by virtue of stipulations in the treaty between France and the United States governing the Louisiana Purchase; similar provisions were part of the treaty between Spain and the United States concerning the acquisition of West Florida.

In the North

By 1860, some 200,000 free Negroes lived in the North. Unattached to the plantation, they were the most mobile sector of the black people. Wherever they settled, they constituted an organized community. The search for educational opportunities was a communitywide project. As early as 1833, blacks in Philadelphia organized over 50 different voluntary associations "for their moral and intellectual improvement".[6] Yet, the life of blacks in that city was hard. Their children were excluded from the public schools. In Cleveland, on the other hand, many of the blacks had been free Negroes in the South and had accumulated some capital. The schools of Cleveland were open to all. In rural areas, black communities organized private schools, sometimes with the aid of the Society of Friends. Negroes in Connecticut faced difficult conditions. In 1859, John T. Waugh, an escaped slave, then resident in Providence, R.I., told a Convention of Colored Persons that "when he was a slave in the South, and attempted to gain his freedom, he had no idea of living to see his son excluded from a Rhode Island school."[7]

During the 40 years after the American Revolution, roughly from 1790 to 1830, private schools for Negro children were built by blacks in fewer than a dozen cities. Although wealthy white abolitionists occasionally contributed money, the facilities remained exceedingly minimal. Publicly funded schools were all but unavailable for black children. Hostile whites often set fire to black schools. In Ohio, however, "if one (school) house was burned, another was put up in its place."[8]

In the course of the 1820's, black parents began to see the fruits of their agitation for opening the public schools. Boston school authorities permitted a single all-black public school in 1820. In Ohio, the common school law of 1829 explicitly excluded Negro children from its benefits. Black parents fought to change the law; not until the 1850's did the legislature permit all-black public schools. During the decade 1853-1862, Negro enrollment in these schools rose tenfold from 702 to 7,456.[9] In neighboring Pennsylvania, the same decade saw the legislature grant black parents limited access to public schools, although in segregated circumstances.

Negro parents accepted segregated schools if these were the price of any education. During the 1840's and 1850's, however, many black communities rebelled against what they called "caste schools". They rejected segregation of schools as well as the separation of children by race inside the school.[10] Mass meetings, door-to-door canvassing, and legislative lobbying were some of the techniques employed.[11]

School finance was racially discriminatory. Even with blacks excluded from the public schools, they were still required to pay school taxes. Such was the case in Illinois, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, Rhode Island, and other States. Blacks in those States were taxed for the benefit of white children. As Frederick Douglass declared: "In the northern States, we are not slaves to individuals, not personal slaves, yet in many respects we are the slaves of the community."[12] A more basic inequity arose from the fact that both slaves and free Negroes were enumerated when a territory applied for statehood. Part of the statehood process was a large-scale Federal land grant for the exclusive purpose of financing common schools. Between 1803 and 1864, more than 27 million acres of Federal lands were given to the States for schools.[13] In the South, no slave children and virtually no free Negro children were permitted to share the benefit of these funds. In a number of northern States, black children were similarly shortchanged.

The Civil War created the conditions for fundamental change. Nearly 200,000 blacks had fought for their freedom. After the war, for the first time in two and a half centuries, blacks were free to explore and consolidate their own way of life. That way rested on economic security, equal citizenship, and education.

Black Education, 1865-1950

The movement to educate the freedmen and their children, wrote DuBois, "started with the

Negroes themselves and they continued to form the dynamic force behind it."[14] Freedmen built and owned numerous schools all over the South. By 1870, in Virginia alone, 111 schools were owned outright and another 215 supported in part by freedmen.[15] Northern missionary groups contributed money, teaching materials, and—most important—teachers. Between 1866 and 1870, the Freedmen's Bureau supplemented the private efforts of freedmen and missionaries with aid in building schools. Even then, freedmen paid for one-half to two-thirds of the cost of schooling.[16] White public opinion in the South was almost uniformly hostile towards these schools. Many were burned to the ground and their teachers mistreated.[17]

By 1870, 9 out of 10 school-age Negro children were still not in school. The key to expanded opportunity lay in opening the public schools to Negro children. The decade of the 1870's saw a gigantic step forward toward this goal, as follows:[18]

	Number of Negro Children Age 5-19 (000)	Negro Enrollment Rate (Percent of age group)	White Enrollment Rate (Percent of age group)	Number of Negro Children in School (000)	Number of Negro Children Not in School (000)
1860	1,741.0	1.9	59.6	33.1	1,708.0
1870	1,825.7	9.9	54.4	180.7	1,645.0
1880	2,531.7	33.8	62.0	885.7	1,676.0

This progress rested on a powerful political base that freedmen had constructed. Throughout the South, black political power was used to create and/or pry open public school systems for all children. In a number of States, school expenditures per child were roughly equal as between black and white. In Mississippi, the attendance rate for black children exceeded the rate for white children.[18]

The close of the Reconstruction period brought an abrupt end to black power, and thereby to school progress. Between 1880 and 1900, blacks were deprived of the right to vote, terrorized into acquiescence after decades of violence, and forced into a shadowland of civic existence. School expansion became a thing of the past for blacks; in 1880, their enrollment rate had been 33.8 percent; in 1900, it was 31.1 percent. Per pupil expenditures became lopsided. South Carolina in the mid-1870's spent equal amounts for black and white schools. By 1895, per pupil expenditures for white schools were nearly triple those in black schools.[19]

During the first 30 years of the 20th century, planned deprivation of black education in the South was joined with compulsory segregation. By refusing to build sufficient schools for black children, the State ensured that a disproportionate part of State aid would accrue to the white schools. State aid was based on a census of school-age children; the lower attendance of black children created a "surplus" of unspent State aid that was then used for the benefit of the white schools, thus compounding the initial inequity.

Segregation of schools created an organizational framework for transferring public funds in a racially discriminatory way. Every aspect of schools reflected this systematic process. From 1900 to 1930, the school year for blacks increased from 57 to 97 days, while that for whites more than doubled. Teachers in black schools taught from a third to three-quarters more children than teachers in white schools; and the ratio of black to white teacher salaries dropped from 86 percent in 1899-1900 to 52 percent in 1920.[20] Educational innovations were reserved for whites; in Atlanta during 1925, the public schools operated 40 kindergartens for white children, but none for blacks.[21] From 1924 to 1926, the State of Mississippi built 48 white agricultural high schools for whites, but only one for blacks.[22] In 1934, Horace Mann Bond wrote that Negro children "receive a smaller proportion of public funds in the Southern States than they have at any time in past history."[23]

After the Civil War, blacks suddenly started moving to cities in the South, but this stream slowed by 1870. Nevertheless, between 1880 and

1920, the number of blacks in 25 southern cities rose from 368,000 to 924,000. In general, educational opportunities for Negro children were better in the cities than on the countryside. Yet, during a 10-year period of migration, 1908-1918, a number of southern counties tended to reduce black teachers' salaries as the black enrollment rose. This facilitated the transfer of black school appropriations to white schools.[24] At the same time, more children enrolled in and completed elementary schools; thus, the migrations within the South increased pressures for the building of secondary schools for black children. By 1928-1929, fewer than 4 percent of all accredited high schools in the South were open to black children.[25]

Blacks in the North were predominantly urban. Their children had more schooling opportunities than did blacks in the South. In 1910, 84.2 percent of northern black children aged 6-14 were in school, as compared with 57.9 percent of southern black children.

Segregation was a fact of life, if not of law, in northern schools. Black parents fought against separate schools in most cases. By 1920, as the northward migration begun during World War I broadened, nearly 750,000 Negroes lived in 15 northern cities. New York City became the leading black city in the country; Philadelphia was second, outstripping all southern cities; and Chicago was third, containing almost as many blacks as Washington, D.C., the largest black city in the South.

In Chicago, during the Civil War, the school board had created racially separate schools, but black parents refused to send their children and separation was abolished at war's end. In many Illinois districts, school taxes were collected from Negro taxpayers, but their children were excluded from the schools. After World War I, segregation in racially changing neighborhoods in Chicago was maintained by building second-rate branch schools near the main building.[26] The number of black teachers was strictly controlled and a racially discriminatory policy of teacher assignment was followed.[27] During the 1930's and 1940's, numerous black children attended schools on a double shift while white children had a full day of school.[28]

In New York City, the influx of southern Negroes during the 1920's challenged the school system, which responded variously. P.S. 89 in Harlem, 93 percent black in 1920, reportedly sent all but 10 percent of its graduates on to high school.[29] P.S. 119, three-quarters black in 1920, responded by instituting prevocational subjects, such as "millinery, dressmaking, practical homemaking, industrial art, and cooking."[30] Black parents complained about racially derogatory material in textbooks, but little was done to remedy the situation.[31] By the early 1930's, overcrowding had become extreme; yet, no new schools were built in Harlem. The absence of blacks on the school board became a community issue during the 1930's. In the middle of the decade, an official report contained this comment: "It seems that many of the white teachers appointed to the schools of Harlem regard the appointment as a sort of punishment ... There appears to be a great deal of turnover in white personnel in these schools."[32] The LaGuardia administration suppressed the report of a committee of its own choosing that was highly critical of city school policies in Harlem.

In New Jersey, State school authorities regularly violated laws and court decisions that outlawed segregated schools.[33] During the mid-1920's, many of the State's elementary schools were segregated. In 1925, a researcher reported:

> From the university town of Princeton, including the capital city of Trenton, southward to Cape May, every city or town with a considerable Negro population supports the dual educational system, with a building for its white and a building for its Negro pupils of the grammar grades ... In no town south of Elizabeth does a colored teacher have a class with white children in it, though wholly colored classes are sometime found with a white teacher in charge.[34]

An inquiry initiated by the State legislature 14 years later found conditions had worsened. Segregation had spread and a deterioration of educational conditions set in.[35]

Thus, in the North, school officials were not often eager to translate legal rights of Negro children into classroom realities. Black parents were the primary enforcers of these rights which were sought through organized collective action.[36] The initiative for the creation of segregated schools in the North usually lay with school districts, given the appearance of legality by State complicity.

Black migration to urban areas, both North and South, necessarily involved the problem of housing. During 1910-1916, many southern cities

passed ordinances decreeing compulsory residential segregation. These were outlawed by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1917. Within the real estate industry, the racial regulation of housing was viewed as an economic necessity. Under the leadership of the Chicago Real Estate Board during the 1920's, techniques were perfected to segregate cities further along racial lines. Nationwide patterns of segregation were enforced by the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The block-by-block pattern of ghetto expansion was created and maintained by the real estate practice of refusing to sell or rent housing on a block to a Negro unless at least one Negro already lived there.

These efforts were remarkably successful. As the following table indicates, residential segregation in northern cities increased sharply between 1910 and 1930.[38] (The index of residential segregation expresses the degree to which Negroes would have to be redistributed over a city in order to achieve in each census tract or ward the same racial ratio as prevails in the city as a whole. The greater the segregation, the higher the index number.)

Indexes of Residential Segregation Between Negroes and Native Whites, 10 Northern Cities, 1910 and 1930

	1910	1930
Boston	64.1	77.9
Buffalo	62.6	80.5
Chicago	66.8	85.2
Cincinnati	47.3	72.8
Cleveland	60.6	85.0
Columbus	31.6	62.8
Philadelphia	46.0	63.4
Pittsburgh	44.1	61.4
St. Louis	54.3	82.1
Syracuse	64.0	86.7

Northern schools adjusted to these demographic changes in fairly uniform ways. Attendance areas were redrawn to separate black from white children. In rapidly changing areas, school boards often created optional attendance areas to enable white parents to select schools in accordance with the most recent racial statistics. The grade span of predominantly black schools was sometimes extended so as to prevent children in these schools from passing on to a nearby advanced white school. At times, Negro students were placed in a separate wing of a school or annex or in a separate room, even in the basement. Schools designed for black students were located in the growing number of solidly black residential areas. In order to minimize protest at these measures from occurring within the school systems, blacks were not appointed to school boards and higher managerial posts.[39]

Black Education Since the 1930's

Change in the South

During the late 1930's, black teachers introduced a new dynamic into southern education when they began a series of legal actions to achieve equal pay for equal work. Uniformly, courts ruled in their favor; thus, equalization of teacher salaries became the first occasion for the practice of anything near equality of black and white schooling in the South. Between 1939-1940 and 1953-1954, the ratio of black teachers' salaries to those of teachers in southern white schools increased from 57 to 85 percent. Since instructional expense is the largest part of total school expenditures, per pupil expenditures during the same years increased significantly. Over the same period, the ratio of black to white per pupil expenditures rose from 32 to 61 percent.[40] This permitted the almost total elimination of the differential length of school term. In 1939-1940, Negro schools ran 156 days; all white schools, 175 days. By 1953-1954, the figures were 177 and 179. Average days of attendance at the earlier year were 126 and 152; at the later years, 151 and 159.[41]

The basic pattern of discrimination remained undiminished if no longer undisturbed. Decades of deliberate deprivation had created such enormous black-white disparities that recent advances did little to reduce the size of the absolute gap. Between 1939 and 1952, while the gap of current expenditures per pupil in six southern States narrowed from 57.3 to 30.3 percent, the size of the actual gap in dollars was reduced from $53.85 only to $50.15.[42] In Mississippi, which schooled a 10th of the South's black children, 95 percent of all the single-teacher schools during 1953-1954 were black. The speaker of Mississippi's House of Representatives acknowledged in 1954 that "in the past we actually have not maintained a dual

system of schools financially. We have maintained a white system."[43]

In 1954, the U. S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* that racially separate schools were inherently unequal. (*Brown* is discussed in detail in the following chapter.) Not only did the decision go unenforced in the Deep South—the system of discriminatory expenditures also continued. Arkansas in 1961 spent 23 percent more for each white pupil than for each black pupil.[44] During 1957, per pupil expenditures on whites averaged 14 percent higher in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina.[45] The number of accredited high schools for blacks continued to lag severely behind those for whites, even in the same communities. Funds for construction of black schools, presumably to demonstrate that quality of education could rise under segregation, made few inroads on the basic inequality. In the South as a whole, percentage increases in building expenditures for blacks exceeded those for whites in the mid-1950's. But, as one observer reported: "Despite the superiority of Negro percentages increases, actual total values reported for 1955-56 and in 1956-57 show that white plant value totals remained greatly superior."[46]

Change came from currents stirred by the organized civil rights movement. In the late 1950's, localized black protests against segregation began the process. It was, however, the student "sit-in" movement, begun in 1960, that upset dramatically the state of quietude in school practices. Black college and high school students became the mainsprings of social change in the South. During the early 1960's, they led in registering blacks to vote. Southern Negroes, it will be recalled, had gained initial entry into the public schools nearly a century earlier via political power. The voter registration campaign was the prelude to bringing such power to bear on the broadest range of civic rights.

Change in the North

Black children in the North attended essentially segregated schools which were systematically inferior to white schools in the same communities. As in the past, school boards, with varying degrees of deliberateness, perpetuated and extended racial lines in schools. In Detroit, for example, a member of the board of education testified in 1961 on its practice of changing school boundaries as the racial composition of the attendance area changed; in this way, black and white children were strictly separated.[47] In one northern city after another, black achievement scores lagged behind white scores. (See Chapter 6, for a detailed discussion of this subject.)

From 1960 to 1964, blacks in New York City built a strong protest movement against segregation and ineffective education. Puerto Ricans joined in, as well as some whites. School boycotts were the principal technique of protest. The school board, besides issuing statements favoring integration, failed to adopt a program of action to meet parents' protests. In Chicago, during the same years, a similar movement arose. More so than in New York City, segregation in Chicago became a central issue. Large-scale protest actions erupted in Boston, Cleveland, Gary, and many other northern cities.[48] Little immediate change in specific educational practices resulted from mass protests. In the long run, however, the protest movement schooled many thousand minority students and parents in the problems of effecting change in modern urban school systems. School protests became intertwined with issues of political representation, housing, public accommodations, and others. The emergence of a community control movement is easier to understand in the context of a decade of increasing civic participation around the segregated schools issue.

Black Higher Education

Before the Civil War

Black participation in higher education during its first two centuries of history was almost imperceptible. By 1865, fewer than 30 blacks had graduated from an American college or university. More had attended without graduating. Many more were excluded from initial entry. Among the institutions which refused to accept black students were Princeton University, Wesleyan University in Connecticut, Brown University, and Union College.[49] Harvard Medical School admitted three blacks in 1850, but ejected them after a year. White students insisted on their expulsion. After some hesitation, the faculty agreed.[50] Oberlin College and Antioch College, founded in 1833 and 1852, respectively, both accepted Negro students. During the 1840's and 1850's, some four to five percent of total enrollment at Oberlin was black.[51]

Civil War to 1919: South

During the half-century after the Civil War, the characteristic American college was a small, mediocre, private institution of doubtful durability, which only moderately saw its purpose as the promotion of scholarship, which enrolled both collegiate and secondary school students, and which, in great measure, hewed to the color line.

Since southern governments refused to contribute public funds for black higher education, the initiative lay with northern missionary groups, joined later on by black church groups in the South. The American Missionary Association (AMA) was foremost in supplying facilities and teaching personnel. Its supporters hoped to establish colleges open to the poor of all races. That the schools ultimately became *Negro* colleges was a matter of external political pressure, not original design. One cost they had to pay because of the pressure was a series of distortions and exaggerations of structure. Around the turn of the century, somewhat more than one-quarter of all American college students were, in fact, enrolled in precollegiate programs. In the black colleges, however, about nine-tenths of the enrollment consisted of preparatory students.[52] The dearth of public high schools for Negroes largely accounted for the difference. Poverty forced the black colleges to cut corners in every aspect of operation. Nevertheless, until 1900, at least 2,330 blacks graduated from American colleges, more than four-fifths from black colleges.[53]

Meaningful public support for black higher education had seemed a realistic possibility in 1862 when Congress passed the Morrill Act. Each State was given funds to set up land-grant colleges. The States chose to use the funds almost exclusively for white students. Under the second Morrill Act, of 1890, the receipt of Federal funds was made dependent on a State pledge that these would be "equitably divided" between blacks and whites.

The new Morrill black land-grant colleges were severely handicapped by southern governments. In 1881-1882, Georgia, for example, appropriated some $14,000 for white colleges and $8,000 for a black college. By 1913-1914, the support for white public colleges had risen to $539,000 while that for the black college remained unchanged.[54] When the new colleges attempted to adopt liberal arts programs, State authorities vetoed the effort. They were maintained as trade schools. After a decade of the second Morrill Act, expenditures on white land-grant colleges exceeded those for black ones by a ratio of approximately 26 to one.[55]

Black Higher Schooling in the North to 1910

Between 1876 and 1900, some 13 blacks a year graduated from northern colleges or universities, one-third from Oberlin alone. While racial restrictions appeared even at Oberlin during these years, at other schools outright exclusion was the rule. Amherst College's president George Harris wrote in 1900 that he advised blacks against attending a northern college: "The color line is so sharply drawn ... unfortunately ... that a Negro is at a great disadvantage, not in studies, but socially."[56] Princeton continued to turn away all black applicants; Vassar strongly advised blacks not to come; South Dakota State College reported "the attitude towards Negro students is not favorable with the student body."[57] In 1915, Rutgers admitted its third Negro student in 149 years. This student, the late Paul Robeson, was an unbelievable combination of intellectual brilliance, musical and dramatic talent, and athletic prowess—unmatched by his white classmates. In 1913, DuBois reported that northern colleges had for the past decade been discouraging Negro attendance. At Cornell University, he wrote, they were being excluded from dormitories; Columbia University and the University of Chicago were accused of trying to minimize the number of Negro students in their summer sessions.[58]

Near the eve of World War I, black America had established a tradition of higher education. The private black college was its principal avenue. About 4,000 Negroes had been graduated; one-sixth were women. The recency of the achievement is underscored by the fact that fully 70 percent of the graduates had completed their courses since 1890. Eight black colleges—six in the South, two in the North—accounted for half of the graduates.

Negro Colleges, 1910-1930

From 1914 to 1931, enrollment in the black colleges nearly doubled while the number of students in collegiate-level courses grew by nearly 1,700 percent. By 1931, collegiate-level enrollment

constituted 60 percent of total enrollment. Financially, the colleges were extremely weak. Even after several decades of special effort, in 1925 more than 70 percent of total endowment of black colleges was in only two institutions—Hampton Institute and Tuskegee Institute. Both had attracted comparatively large gifts from foundations and individuals on the basis of their industrial, not collegiate, curricula.

Educational standards remained low, even as enrollment expanded. Library facilities and laboratory equipment were most scanty. Buildings were often located in areas unsuited to their purpose; the range of curricula was exceedingly narrow; some colleges lacked even a catalog. Southern State governments made few or no efforts to encourage black colleges to seek accreditation, one reason being the necessary expenditure of public funds if the goal were attained. The Georgia State department of education acknowledged in the mid-1920's that "while the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools are rigidly adhered to in accrediting white universities and colleges ... it [i.e., Georgia] does not strictly enforce these requirements in granting recognition to Negro higher educational institutions."[59]

Black educators petitioned in vain for accreditation. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools refused to consider the requests since to grant accreditation, even after onsite examination of the colleges, would ordinarily require the newly accredited college to be admitted as a member of the all-white association. In 1930, the association devised a new category—"approved", rather than "accredited"—and applied it to seven black colleges. The new category was widely understood to imply that accreditation standards "were being watered down when applied to the Negro schools."[60] Not until 1961 could black colleges become fully accredited and equal members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Traditionally, students in black colleges had been subjected to a severe regimen of personal conduct and close scrutiny of their political thought. Both were aspects of white control of their institutions. Located, as were so many black colleges, in a predominantly white countryside or town, their students were under eternal watch. Being on one's best behavior was interpreted by black college administrators as meaning self-subjection to quasimilitary regulation. Political orthodoxy was not less highly valued by dominant white society. Langston Hughes, the poet, after touring 50 Negro colleges and high schools in 1932, complained that many of the colleges were "doing their best to produce spineless Uncle Toms, uninformed, and full of mental and moral evasions."[61]

Negroes in Northern Colleges, 1915-1945

Between 1910 and 1940, the black population of the North rose from 1.1 million to nearly 3.0 million. This growth and, more important, the greater accessibility of secondary schools brought about increasing black enrollment in northern colleges and universities.

While most colleges generally opened their doors to Negro applicants, exceptions were widespread. The University of Dayton officially excluded blacks from day classes—in deference to numerous southern white students—while Skidmore College accepted blacks only as day students.[62] The University of Cincinnati excluded Negroes from its schools of medicine and engineering; in 1928, Northwestern University began to exclude them from its school of medicine.[63] Quota systems were frequently imposed. Butler University had an annual quota of 10 blacks while the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School admitted only two blacks each year.[64] In a study published in 1948, Roche found that "at least 22 Catholic colleges and universities totally excluded Negroes ..."[65] Seventeen years earlier, three Catholic institutions—Holy Cross, Notre Dame, and Worcester College—barred blacks.[66]

The number of black college students in the North grew from 1,400 in 1924 to 2,538 in 1932. Enrollment was highly concentrated. In 1928 half of the black students attended 10 colleges—five of them public, five private. Ohio State University was the most popular during the 1920's and 1930's. While both North and South exchanged black students, the North was a net exporter to the South.

Once enrolled in college, blacks were sometimes excluded from specific curricula, especially from medicine. Black practice teachers from predominantly white universities were rejected by local public school systems in Philadelphia, St. Paul, and Oberlin, Ohio.[67]

Black students were most often excluded from living in oncampus college dormitories. In 1931, institutions practicing such exclusion included numerous State universities (Indiana, Iowa, Arizona, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Pennsylvania) and better known private colleges such as Bryn Mawr, Macalester, Temple, and Villanova.[68] Some universities refused to permit black women to live in the dormitories while extending the privilege to Negro men. This was the case at the University of Chicago and Ohio State University.

Eating facilities were frequently closed to black students. In the late 1930's, according to a U. S. Office of Education study:

> On some campuses the public eating places were open to all students alike; on other campuses only certain places were open; on one campus separate booths or tables were set aside for Negro students ... In some instances there were almost no public eating places in the city to which the Negro students were admitted...[69]

College administrations not only enforced the exlusion on campus, but also apparently failed to protest the offcampus discrimination.

Racial considerations permeated intercollegiate athletics. From shortly before World War I well into the 1930's, a college team customarily benched a black player if the opposing team protested his presence.[70] Racial exclusion was policed by the intercollegiate athletic conferences. When in 1913 the University of Nebraska refused to bench a black football player at the demand of the University of Kansas team, the Missouri Valley Conference apparently added its pressure. Nebraska resigned from the conference in protest.[71] Such fortitude was extremely rare.

Intramural athletics were marked by even stricter segregation. Black women were barred almost everywhere from swimming with their white classmates, specifically at the universities of Iowa and Cincinnati. The University of Kansas prohibited both black men and women from intramural swimming. Basketball and wrestling were virtually white preserves.

Student social activities were segregated with the affirmative support of college administrations. "...The attitude of the Northern institutions toward the Negro student," wrote DuBois in 1926, "is one which varies from tolerance to active hostility."[72] The president of a college in the Ku Klux Klan belt of Ohio explained that while black and while students were welcome to attend all official college social functions, including the president's reception, "we would not like to require either group to admit the other to their respective social functions, dances, etc., for no benefit would likely result."[73] A dean of a university in Iowa "stated that colored students are welcome to the university and to all that it offers, but that they must not expect the university to solve the race problem."[74]

Black students protested against the regime of discrimination. They organized collectively for both fellowship and self-defense. Turned away from the white sororities and fraternities, they began in 1906—at Cornell University—to form black organizations. Greek letter groups for blacks sprang up even where the number of potential members was small. Excluded from all-campus interfraternity councils, the black groups existed at the margin of campus affairs, but central to the needs and interests of their members. They were a rare refuge for blacks on white campuses.

The maintenance of all-white faculties was an impregnable policy of northern colleges and universities. As of 1941, not a single full-time black classroom teacher, tenured or untenured, taught in a northern institution of higher education.[75] Lack of qualified applicants was not the problem. In 1936, a sizable group of black Ph.D's was available for employment, but fully 80 percent of them taught in three black institutions: Atlanta, Fisk, and Howard Universities.[76]

Black college students in the North valued highly the accessibility of a black community. Here could be found housing quarters, meals, leads on possible student employment, and relaxation. The colleges had almost no impact on the black communities. Very few black youngsters enrolled, even in the case of colleges located in cities of large black population. The first Negro student at the University of Pennsylvania, located in Philadelphia, entered in 1879; both his parents were foreign-born. Blacks were excluded from working in these colleges. In 1935, when nearly half a million Negroes lived in New York City, not one was employed as teacher or clerk in the College of the City of New York. The same was true, apparently, at other parts of the municipal institution.[77] Blacks were thus subjected to a rigid negative employment quota of 100 to 0, which enforced by an affirmative action program on behalf of segregation.

Black Graduate Study, 1865-1945

In 1930, public higher education institutions in the South enrolled over 11,000 white students in graduate and professional study. At the same time, not a single Negro in the South was receiving such State-supported training.[78] When a Presidential commission on higher education reported the next year, only a minority statement, written by three black college presidents, emphasized the insufficiency of higher—including professional—education facilities for Negroes.[79] Federal grants to the States for research were channeled without exception to white State colleges.[80] Faculty and students in black colleges were unable to utilize grants for research and advanced training.

During the decade following 1935, a number of court decisions opened the doors of heretofore white public higher institutions to a few individual black applicants. (The legal aspects of these cases are discussed in the next chapter.) To keep the number at a minimum, State legislatures established overnight "graduate schools" at black colleges. Their meagerness was consciously designed. But, meanwhile for the most part, southern white university educators had only models of graduate study at their own institutions.[81]

Black Higher Education Since 1945

In the South

Black-white inequalities in southern higher education institutions far exceeded racial differentials in the common schools. In 1955, the following per student ratios of white to black existed in southern public higher education:[82]

6-1	Number of higher institutions
8-1	Degrees conferred
9-1	Enrollment
10-1	Value of buildings and grounds
11-1	Library expenditures
11-1	Current income
16-1	Preparation of faculty
18-1	Library volumes

During the following decade, some of these differentials abated; others grew less favorable. From 1959 to 1969, the endowment of black colleges fell from three-fifths to one-half that of white colleges; black colleges also received a declining Federal contribution to their income, while Federal support was rising for white colleges.[83] Per student outlay for black colleges, however, increased sharply during the 1960's.

Approaching the 1970's, black colleges as a whole were comparable with white colleges in the same region and similar size. Other than in buildings, grounds, and equipment, black colleges offered about the same educational opportunities as their peer white institutions.[84] The drawing power of black colleges held up well. From 1953 to 1967, their enrollment more than doubled. By 1967, half of all black college students attended other than a traditionally black college. This tendency reflected the growing political power of blacks which—as a century earlier—helped force open the doors of public institutions hitherto closed. A growing majority of middle class blacks were bypassing the traditional black private college in favor of former all-white colleges.[85] As a consequence, the black colleges were faced with educating students who came predominantly from economically poor homes and required special financial help. While the black colleges had scored heroic achievements, they continued to be faced by historic patterns of inequality, virtually unrelieved by government.[86]

In the North

The issue of racial discrimination in colleges and universities became national for the first time in 1947 on release of a report by the President's Commission on Higher Education. It singled out for attack "the prevalence of quota systems and policies of exclusion". With reference to minority students enrolled in colleges, the Commission declared that "the frustrations of social discrimination—in the dormitories, in honorary societies, in fraternities and sororities, on athletic teams, and at social functions—strike at ... [their] personal dignity."[87] An end to segregation laws was advocated; this recommendation brought on a dissent by a minority of the Commission.

In 1948, members of the Association of American Colleges debated the issue at the group's annual meeting. While the association acknowledged that "many colleges discriminate against minority racial and religious groups", it opposed laws against discrimination as an infringement of the freedom of the independent college![88] Discriminatory patterns lingered in many cases for two more decades.

American universities in the North and South averaged between two and three percent black attendance by 1970. In higher education as a whole—including black colleges—the figure fluctuated from just over 4.5 percent to a high of 5.8 percent. Predominantly white institutions sought out the most obviously talented black high school graduates while ignoring the others. More black youths appeared on university campuses. But with respect to percent of high school graduates entering college, the black-white gap grew:[89]

Ratio of high school graduates entering college, 1963-1968

Year	Non-white percent	White percent	Gap percent
1963	38.1	45.6	7.5
1968	46.2	56.6	10.4

Since "non-whites" also includes Asians, it is likely that the actual gap for blacks and whites was even larger than indicated here.

Blacks were enrolled disproportionately in community colleges. By 1973, two-fifths of all black college students attended them while 25 percent went to traditional black colleges and 35 percent were in traditionally white 4-year colleges. The academic significance of high community college enrollments was difficult to establish. First, the basic numerical data were exceedingly defective.[90] Second, the graduation rate of community college students was only half that of senior college students of comparable ability.[91] Third, the dropout rate of black community college students was more than twice that of all community college students.[92]

Rising black enrollment in predominantly white institutions did not automatically cause oncampus discrimination to disappear. In the early 1960's, official housing discrimination existed at the University of Chicago, Rutgers, and Indiana University.[93] Student protests brought an end to these practices. Financial aid became a crucial student service when black and other minority students enrolled. Outright grants were relatively unavailable for poorer students whose aid consisted more of pay for working in school-connected employment. When Federal aid funds slumped during the early 1970's, black enrollment apparently also dropped. Few colleges and universities provided aid from their permanent budget. Aid to minority students tended to be viewed as a "special" expenditure.

Racial restrictions on college athletics fell away during the 1950's and 1960's as a result of civil rights pressure and the example of growing black involvement in professional sports. Little initiative came from the colleges themselves. With wider black participation, however, came new forms of discrimination. Black players were not given coaching positions; nor did the athletic conferences employ more than token numbers of blacks.[94] On northern and southern campuses a sense of estrangement pervaded social activities involving black and white students. Whether at the University of Georgia or the University of Illinois, black students were given to feel they did not "belong".[95]

Black faculty started to make their appearance at predominantly white campuses. In 1941, the first full-time black professor was employed at a virtually all-white institution. He was anthropologist Allison Davis, whose salary at the University of Chicago was paid by the Rosenwald Fund. Seven years later, however, the university's sociology department refused to employ Professor E. Franklin Frazier, eminent black sociologist. William F. Ogburn, departmental chairman, explained to a colleague that the appointment was not possible because the wives of white professors would object.[96] Not until the late 1960's did colleges begin to feel even slight pressure from the Federal Government to employ minority faculty. After 5 years of such pressure, the results were exceedingly minimal.

By 1970, more than a third of a million black young people were enrolled full time in higher education. They were distributed by field as follows:[97]

	Number	Percent of total
Undergraduate	344,819	6.9
Graduate	16,334	4.2
Medicine	1,752	4.1
Dentistry	570	3.8
Law	2,454	3.9
	365,929	6.7

Over the previous century, blacks had succeeded in creating a tradition of higher education. This was achieved in the face of a powerful structure of deprivation constructed by government and the learned professions.

FOOTNOTES

[1]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1905* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), p. 166.

[2]Data in U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 10-11 and 213-214. These figures express the enrollment rate per 100 in the age-group 5-19 years.

[3]*North Star*, December 5, 1850 in Philip S. Foner (ed.), *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, Vol. II: *Pre-Civil War Decade, 1850-1860* (New York: International, 1950), p. 136.

[4]Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers, 1919), p. 185.

[5]See *ibid.*, p. 167 and Charles S. Sydnor, *Slavery in Mississippi* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1933), p. 53.

[6]William Lloyd Garrison in *Liberator*, July 13, 1833.

[7]*Liberator*, August 26, 1859.

[8]Charles T. Hickock, *The Negro in Ohio, 1802-1870* (Cleveland, Ohio: Williams Publishing and Electric Co., 1896), p. 90.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 106.

[10]For examples of inschool discrimation, see Josephine Brown to Samuel J. May, April 27, 1854 in Carter G. Woodson (ed.), *The Mind of the Negro As Reflected in Letters Written During the Crisis 1800-1860* (Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926), p. 364; Robert H. Bremner and others (eds.), *Children and Youth in America. A Documentary History*, I: *1600-1865* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), p. 445; and H. Easton, *A Treatise on the Intellectual Character and Civil and Political Condition of the Colored People of the United States; and the Prejudice Exercised Towards Them...* (Boston, Mass.: Issac Knapp, 1837,) p. 41

[11]See, for example, *Liberator*, August 2, 1844 and Arthur O. White, "Mid-Nineteenth Century Movements for Desegregated Schools in Six Northern Communities", *Integrated Education*, 10 (November-December 1972).

[12]*Liberator*,, October 27, 1848.

[13]Calculated from data in Paul W. Gates, with a chapter by Robert W. Swenson, *History of Public Land Law Development* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, November 1968), p. 804.

[14]W. E. B. DuBois, "Reconstruction and Its Benefits", *American Historical Review*, (1909-1910), p. 782.

[15]Alreutheus Ambush Taylor, *The Negro in the Reconstruction of Virginia* (Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926), p. 142.

[16]Marjorie Holloman Parker, *The Educational Activities of the Freedmen's Bureau* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951), p. 93.

[17]See, for example, Frederick Douglass, *New National Era*, April 6, 1871 in Foner, *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, IV, pp. 242-243; Vernon L. Wharton, *The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890* (New York: Harper and Row 1965 reprint), p. 245; and Lawrence D. Rice, *The Negro In Texas, 1874-1900* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1971), p. 211.

[18]Wharton, *The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890*, p. 246.

[19]George Brown Tindall, *South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1952), p. 216.

[20]Finis Welch, "Education and Racial Discrimination," June 1972, pp. 21-22 (unpublished).

[21]W. A. Daniel, "Schools," p. 215 in T. J. Woofter, Jr. (ed.), *Negro Problems in Cities* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran, 1928).

[22]W. E. B. DuBois, "The Negro Common School in Mississippi," *Crisis*, (September 1926), p. 92.

[23]Horace Mann Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order* (New York: Octagon Press, 1966, reprint), p. 171.

[24]Thomas Jackson Woofter, Jr., *Negro Migration* (New York: Gray, 1920), pp. 165-166.

[25]Commission on Secondary Schools, *Progress and Plans of Negro High Schools Toward Regional Accreditment* (N.p.: Association of Colleges and Secondary schools for Negroes, 1945), p. iii.

[26]Allen H. Spear, *Black Chicago. The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 205.

[27]See Mary J. Herrick, *Negro Employees of the Chicago Board of Education* (Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1931), pp, 12-13, 18, 19, 32, 34, 35, and 246.

[28]Mary J. Herrick, *The Chicago Schools. A Social and Political History* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1971), p. 223, and St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City*, I (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 44.

[29]*New York Age*, January 17, 1920.

[30]*New York Age*, January 10, 1920.

[31]*New York Age*, March 4, 1922.

[32]Quoted in Celia Lewis Zitron, *The New York City Teachers Union 1916-1964* (New York: Humanities Press, 1968), pp. 86-87.

[33]See Meyer Weinberg, *Race and Place: A Legal History of the Neighborhood School* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 72-73.

[34]Lester B. Granger, "Race Relations and the School System (A Study of Negro High School Attendance in New Jersey)", *Opportunity*, (November 1925), p. 327.

[35]New Jersey State Temporary Commission on the Condition of the Urban Colored Population, *Report ... to the Legislature of the State of New Jersey ... 1939* (Trenton, N.J.: The Legislature, 1939), p. 40.

[36]See, for example, August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, "Negro Boycotts of Jim Crow Schools in the North, 1897-1925," *Integrated Education*. *5(August-September, 1967, pp. 57-68. Cities studied in this article are Alton, Ill., East Orange, N.J., and Springfield and Dayton, Ohio.*

[37]Rose Helper, *The Racial Practices of Real Estate Institutions in Selected Areas of Chicago* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 520.

[38]See Karl E. and Alma F. Taeuber, *Negroes in Cities* (Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), p. 54.

[39]See Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order*, pp. 374-382; Bond, "The Present Status of Racial Integration in the United States, With Especial Reference to Education," *Journal of Negro Education*, (Summer 1952), p. 244; L. D. Reddick, "The Education of Negroes in States Where Separate Schools Are Not Legal," *Journal of Negro Education*, (Summer 1947), p. 299; V. V. and Eleanor O. Oak, "The Illegal Status of Separate Education in New Jersey," *School and Society*, (May 21, 1938); New Jersey State Temporary Commission on the Condition of the Urban Colored People, *Report . . .* pp. 38-45; and Robin M. Williams, Jr. and Margaret W. Ryan (eds.), *Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), p.50

[40]Welch, "Education and Racial Discrimination," p. 22.

[41]Welch, "Black-White Differences in Returns to Schooling," *American Economic Review*, 63 (December 1973), p. 900.

[42]Ernest W. Swanson and John A. Griffin (eds.), *Public Education in the South, Today and Tomorrow. A Statistical Survey* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1955), p. 66.

[43]*Jackson Daily News* March 10, 1954, quoted in James M. Palmer, *Mississippi School Districts. Factors in the Disestablishment of Dual Systems* (State College Mississippi: Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University, August 1971), p. 25.

[44]Arkansas Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Public Education in Arkansas, 1963, Still Separate and Still Unequal* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September, 1963), p. 13.

[45]Tom Flake, "Expenditures. Dollars On a Treadmill," p. 36 in Patrick McCauley and Edward D. Ball (eds.), *Southern Schools: Progress and Problems* (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1959).

[46]Weldon James, "Buildings and Equipment. Too Many Pupils, Too Few Dollars," p. 54 in *ibid.*

[47]Dr. Remus G. Robinson in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearings Held in Detroit, Michigan* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 181-184. See, also, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Education 1961 . . . Report* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 103-104.

[48]On New York, see Annie Stein, "Strategies for Failure," *Harvard Educational Review*, 41(May 1971) pp 158-204. On Chicago, see U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1963 Staff Report, *Public Education* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 85; Lawrence Landry, "The Chicago School Boycott," *New University Thought*, (December 1963-January 1964); and Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," *Integrated Education*, 2(August-September 1964). On Boston, see Noel Day, "The Freedom Movement in Boston," *Integrated Education*, 2(December 1964-January 1965).

[49]See Alexander Crummell, *The Attitude of the American Mind Toward the Negro Intellect*, The American Negro Academy, Occasional Papers, No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: The Academy, 1898), p. 12; *Liberator*, February 26, 1856; *Liberator*, October 3, 1845; *Liberator*, May 17, 1839, and Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, p. 265

[50]See Victor Ullman, *Martin R. Delany. The Beginnings of Black Nationalism* (Boston, Mass.: Beacon, 1971), p. 18.

[51]W.E. Biggiestone, "Oberlin College and the Negro Student, 1865-1940," *Journal of Negro History*, 56(July 1971), p. 198.

[52]See Seymour E. Harris, *A Statistical Portrait of Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 931; and Charles H. Thompson, "75 Years of Negro Education," *Crisis*, 45 (July 1938), p. 204

[53]See W.E.B. DuBois (ed.), *The College-Bred Negro* (Atlanta, Ga.: Atlant University Press, 1900), p. 42

[54]See data in James A. Colston, *State Financial Support of Higher Education in Georgia from 1932 to 1949 with Specific Reference to Higher Education for the Negro* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958), p. 46

[55]John Sekora, "Murder Relentless and Impassive: The American Academic Community and the Negro College," *Soundings*, 51(Fall 1968) p. 259

[56]Quoted in DuBois, *The College-Bred Negro*, p. 106

[57]W.E.B. Du Bois and Augustus G. Dill (eds.), *The College-Bred Negro American* (Atlanta, Ga.: Atlanta University Press, 1910), p. 75.

[58]*Crisis*, (July 1913), pp. 129 and 132.

[59]Arthur J. Klein (ed.), *Survey of Negro Colleges and Universities* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1929), p. 246.

[60]Malcolm O'Leary, *Accreditation of Negro Colleges and Secondary Schools by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools* (Master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1965), p. 22.

[61]Langston Hughes, "Cowards from the College," *Crisis*, 41 (August 1934). p. 227.

[62]*Crisis*, August 1930, pp. 262-263.

[63]See *Crisis*, January 1932, p. 466 and Charles S. Johnson, *The Negro College Graduate* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1938), p. 121.

[64]See *Crisis*, August 1930, p. 263 and Elizabeth Yates, *Howard Thurman. Portrait of a Practical Dreamer* (New York: John Day, 1964), p. 63.

[65]Richard J. Roche, *Catholic Colleges and the Negro Student* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948), p. 79.

[66]*Crisis*, August 1931, p. 262.

[67]See Leslie Pinckney Hill, "The State Teachers' College at Cheyney and Its Relation to Segregation in the North," *Journal of Negro Education*, (October 1932), p. 413; Anna Arnold Hedgman, *The Trumpet Sounds. A Memoir of Negro Leadership* (New York: Holt, 1964), pp. 16-17; and Biggiestone, "Oberlin College and the Negro Student, 1865-1940," p. 217. Black students from Oberlin were excluded from the high school but not from the elementary schools.

[68]See *Crisis*, August 1930, p. 262 and August 1931, p. 262; Herbert Crawford Jenkins, *The Negro Student at*

the University of Iowa. A Sociological Study (Master's thesis, State University of Iowa, 1933), pp. 18 and 29; and Ina Corinne Brown and others, *National Survey of Higher Education of Negroes*, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-1943), pp. 88-89.

[69]Brown and others, *National Survey of Higher Education of Negroes*, II, pp. 88-89.

[70]See, for example, George Fishman, "Paul Robeson's Student Days and the Fight Against Racism at Rutgers," *Freedomways*, 9(Summer 1969), p. 228 and Jenkins, *The Negro Student at the University of Iowa*, p. 32.

[71]*Crisis*, December 1913, p. 63 and January 1914, p. 117.

[72]W. E. B. DuBois, "Negroes in College," *Nation*, 112(March 3, 1926), p. 229.

[73]*Crisis*, January 1927, p. 133.

[74]Jenkins, *The Negro Student at the University of Iowa*, p. 29.

[75]See Michael R. Winston, "Through the Back Door: Academic Racism and the Negro Scholar in Historical Perspective," *Daedalus*, 100(Summer 1971), p. 695 and A. Gilbert Belles, "Negroes Are Few on College Faculties," *Southern Education Report*, 4(July-August 1968), p. 23.

[76]Winston, "Through the Back Door," p. 695.

[77]See *New York Age*, August 10, 1935.

[78]Thompson, "75 Years of Negro Education," pp. 204-205.

[79]National Advisory Committee on Education, *Federal Relations to Education*, Part I, *Committee Findings and Recommendations* (Washington, D.C.: National Capitol Press, 1931), p. 113.

[80]Jim Hightower, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times. The Failure of the Land Grant College Complex* (Washington, D.C.: Agribusiness Accountability Project, 1972), p. 18.

[81]See Horace Mann Bond, "The Evolution and Present Status of Negro Higher and Professional Education in United States," *Journal of Negro Education*, 17 (Summer 1948), p. 225.

[82]Frank A. De Costa, "The Tax-Supported College for Negroes," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 22(February 1958), p. 266.

[83]Andrew Brimmer, "The Economic Outlook and the Future of the Negro College," *Daedalus*, 100(Summer 1971), p. 559.

[84]See Frank Bowles and Frank A. De Costa, *Between Two Worlds, A Profile of Negro Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 9171), pp. 142-144; Alan L. Sorkin, "A Comparison of Quality Characteristics of Negro and White Private and Church-Related Colleges and Universities in the South," *College and University*, 46(Spring 1971) pp. 199-210; and John A. Centra, Robert L. Linn, and Mary Ellen Parry, "Academic Growth in Predominantly Negro and Predominantly White Colleges," *American Educational Research Journal*, 7(January 1970), p. 97.

[85]Daniel C. Thompson, *Private Black Colleges At the Crossroads* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1973), p. 251.

[86]See, for example, William Payne, "The Negro Land-Grant Colleges," *Civil Rights Digest*, 3(Spring 1970), pp. 14 and 17.

[87]U. S. President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, vol. II: *Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1948), pp. 6 and 26.

[88]"Breaking Down the Barriers of Discrimination in Higher Education," *School and Society*, 67(February 14, 1948), pp. 117-118. See, also, Raymond Walters, "The Cincinnati Meeting of the Association of American Colleges," *School and Society*, 67(January 31, 1948), p. 83

[89]See Robert H. Berls, "Higher Education Opportunity and Achievement in the United States," p. 181 in U.S. Congress, 91st, 1st session, Joint Economic Committee, *The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States. A Compendium of Papers ...* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), and John Egerton, "Inflated Body Count," *Change*, (July-August 1970), pp. 13-15.

[90]Andrew L. Goodrich, Lawrence W. Laziotte, and James A. Welch, "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: A Survey," *Community and Junior College Journal*, 43(December 1972-January 1973), p. 29.

[91]John K. Folger, Helene S. Astin, and Alan E. Bayer, *Human Resources and Higher Education* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970), pp. 175 and 177.

[92]Goodrich, Laziotte, and Welch, "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges." A Survey," pp. 29 and 31.

[93]See August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, *CORE. A Study in the Civil Rights Movement 1942-1968* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 185; Emily Alman, "Desegregation at Rutgers University," p. 212 in Rhoda L. Goldstein (ed.), *Black Life and Culture in the United States* (New York: Crowell, 1971); and James P. Comer, *Beyond Black and White* (New York: Quadrangle, 1972), p. 32.

[94]See, for example, Beth Janet Shapiro, *The Black Athlete at Michigan State University* (Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 11 and Robert L. Green, Joseph R. McMillan, and Thomas S. Gunnings, "Blacks in the Big Ten," *Integrated Education*, 10(May-June 1972), p. 39.

[95]See Calvin Trillin, *An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes* (New York: Viking, 1964), p. 83 and Aaron M. Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965), p. 146.

[96]Personal communication in possession of the author.

[97]Basic data in U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education. Fall 1970* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 116, 177, 185, 190, and 200.

the University of Iowa. A Sociological Study (Master's thesis, State University of Iowa, 1933), pp. 18 and 29; and Ina Corinne Brown and others, *National Survey of Higher Education of Negroes*, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-1943), pp. 88-89.

[69]Brown and others, *National Survey of Higher Education of Negroes*, II, pp. 88-89.

[70]See, for example, George Fishman, "Paul Robeson's Student Days and the Fight Against Racism at Rutgers," *Freedomways*, 9(Summer 1969), p. 228 and Jenkins, *The Negro Student at the University of Iowa*, p. 32.

[71]*Crisis*, December 1913, p. 63 and January 1914, p. 117.

[72]W. E. B. DuBois, "Negroes in College," *Nation*, 112(March 3, 1926), p. 229.

[73]*Crisis*, January 1927, p. 133.

[74]Jenkins, *The Negro Student at the University of Iowa*, p. 29.

[75]See Michael R. Winston, "Through the Back Door: Academic Racism and the Negro Scholar in Historical Perspective," *Daedalus*, 100(Summer 1971), p. 695 and A. Gilbert Belles, "Negroes Are Few on College Faculties," *Southern Education Report*, 4(July-August 1968), p. 23.

[76]Winston, "Through the Back Door," p. 695.

[77]See *New York Age*, August 10, 1935.

[78]Thompson, "75 Years of Negro Education," pp. 204-205.

[79]National Advisory Committee on Education, *Federal Relations to Education*, Part I, *Committee Findings and Recommendations* (Washington, D.C.: National Capitol Press, 1931), p. 113.

[80]Jim Hightower, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times. The Failure of the Land Grant College Complex* (Washington, D.C.: Agribusiness Accountability Project, 1972), p. 18.

[81]See Horace Mann Bond, "The Evolution and Present Status of Negro Higher and Professional Education in United States," *Journal of Negro Education*, 17 (Summer 1948), p. 225.

[82]Frank A. De Costa, "The Tax-Supported College for Negroes," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 22(February 1958), p. 266.

[83]Andrew Brimmer, "The Economic Outlook and the Future of the Negro College," *Daedalus*, 100(Summer 1971), p. 559.

[84]See Frank Bowles and Frank A. De Costa, *Between Two Worlds, A Profile of Negro Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 9171), pp. 142-144; Alan L. Sorkin, "A Comparison of Quality Characteristics of Negro and White Private and Church-Related Colleges and Universities in the South," *College and University*, 46(Spring 1971) pp. 199-210; and John A. Centra, Robert L. Linn, and Mary Ellen Parry, "Academic Growth in Predominantly Negro and Predominantly White Colleges," *American Educational Research Journal*, 7(January 1970), p. 97.

[85]Daniel C. Thompson, *Private Black Colleges At the Crossroads* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1973), p. 251.

[86]See, for example, William Payne, "The Negro Land-Grant Colleges," *Civil Rights Digest*, 3(Spring 1970), pp. 14 and 17.

[87]U. S. President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, vol. II: *Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1948), pp. 6 and 26.

[88]"Breaking Down the Barriers of Discrimination in Higher Education," *School and Society*, 67(February 14, 1948), pp. 117-118. See, also, Raymond Walters, "The Cincinnati Meeting of the Association of American Colleges," *School and Society*, 67(January 31, 1948), p. 83

[89]See Robert H. Berls, "Higher Education Opportunity and Achievement in the United States," p. 181 in U.S. Congress, 91st, 1st session, Joint Economic Committee, *The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States. A Compendium of Papers ...* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), and John Egerton, "Inflated Body Count," *Change*, (July-August 1970), pp. 13-15.

[90]Andrew L. Goodrich, Lawrence W. Laziotte, and James A. Welch, "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: A Survey," *Community and Junior College Journal*, 43(December 1972-January 1973), p. 29.

[91]John K. Folger, Helene S. Astin, and Alan E. Bayer, *Human Resources and Higher Education* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970), pp. 175 and 177.

[92]Goodrich, Laziotte, and Welch, "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges." A Survey," pp. 29 and 31.

[93]See August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, *CORE. A Study in the Civil Rights Movement 1942-1968* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 185; Emily Alman, "Desegregation at Rutgers University," p. 212 in Rhoda L. Goldstein (ed.), *Black Life and Culture in the United States* (New York: Crowell, 1971); and James P. Comer, *Beyond Black and White* (New York: Quadrangle, 1972), p. 32.

[94]See, for example, Beth Janet Shapiro, *The Black Athlete at Michigan State University* (Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 11 and Robert L. Green, Joseph R. McMillan, and Thomas S. Gunnings, "Blacks in the Big Ten," *Integrated Education*, 10(May-June 1972), p. 39.

[95]See Calvin Trillin, *An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes* (New York: Viking, 1964), p. 83 and Aaron M. Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965), p. 146.

[96]Personal communication in possession of the author.

[97]Basic data in U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education. Fall 1970* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 116, 177, 185, 190, and 200.

Reprinted from: Meyer Weinberg,
Minority Students: A Research Appraisal,
U.S. Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, National Institute of
Education, March, 1977.

CHAPTER 2
THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

American court decisions were basic to the creation of racially discriminatory public school systems. During the era of slavery as well as in later years, courts adopted an activist stance in a largely successful effort to square school practices with those of a society in which racist doctrines were an article of widespread faith. Judicial lectures from the bench on the divine origin of the racial order were not uncommon. Through the 19th and part of the 20th centuries, the courts appeared to minorities as a recourse without redress.

Favorable court decisions were rare. Even when issued they were violated with impunity; or worse, ignored. State governments themselves frequently violated the decisions or laws based on them. Courts at all levels—State and Federal—followed a common code of conduct with respect to minorities. The U.S. Supreme Court usually supplied the icing on the cake of sorrows baked below.[1] Nor did geography provide a meaningful basis for fundamental distinctions once slavery had been abolished. The temper of northern and southern courts grew more similar.

About mid-20th century, minorities accelerated their political progress and succeeded in making a national issue of their unequal treatment. The courts—along with legislatures—began to manifest changes in their historic orientation. Those changes continue. They take on greater intelligibility when viewed within an historical context.

BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

The first compulsory ignorance law was enacted by South Carolina in 1740. Many southern States followed suit. During times of slave revolts or similar insecurities, nervous white legislatures stiffened the laws, making the fines and terms of imprisonment more stringent.[2] That few violators actually were brought into court attested to the almost unanimous obedience to the laws rather than loose enforcement of them. Late in the 18th and early in the 19th centuries, States enforced apprenticeship laws which required masters to teach even black apprentices to read and write. After a time, those laws were changed to relieve masters of such responsibility if their charges were black.[3]

In the North, State governments did not usually acknowledge a responsibility to educate black children. After Rhode Island liberated slaves in 1784, it failed to honor a provision in the Emancipation Bill making it compulsory to teach freed Negro children to read and write.[4] Some States such as Ohio explicitly closed the public schools to black children in 1829. For the next two decades, Negroes tried to change the common school law. In the late 'Forties and early 'Fifties, separate public schools for blacks were permitted. In Pennsylvania, even separate black public schools were not permitted by law until 1854.

Negro parents were required to pay school taxes whether or not their children could attend the schools. Sometimes the State law stipulated that in such cases, the school tax must be refunded to Negro parents. In Ohio and Illinois, however, authorities kept the money in direct violation of the law.[5] Systematic discrimination against black children was the rule in tangible aspects of schooling.[6]

Courts generally chose to enforce the color line. In *Chalmers v. Stewart*, the Ohio supreme court found in 1842 that a teacher who permitted black

children to sit in a classroom when white parents objected thereby forswore claim to his salary. In that case, Judge Wood ruled that black children were in the class of "vicious and corrupt" persons.[7] The *Chalmers* doctrine was cited 8 years later by the Indiana supreme court in *Lewis v. Henley*. There, the court directed that tuition-paying black students must be excluded from a public school to make room for white children whose parents refused to send them to school with blacks. Judge Perkins explained the State legislature's reasoning in excluding Negro children from public schools as the conviction that "black children were... unfit associates of whites, as school companions."[8] Courts wavered on the importance of skin hue. In 1842, the Ohio supreme court ruled that light-skinned blacks possessed rights equal to those of whites on the ground that, in color, they were nearer white than black.[9] In 1859, the court reversed the ruling and held that blood, not color, was the significant characteristic. It spoke of the "visible taint of African blood."[10]

Iowa was an exception to the general course of events. In its first school law adopted in 1846, the year of statehood, black children were explicitly excluded. Eleven years later, following a campaign for equal school rights led by abolitionist Republicans, the State's constitution was amended to open the schools to all.[11]

One State court found school segregation to be constitutional. In 1850 the highest court in Massachusetts held that Boston school authorities had not acted unreasonably or illegally in requiring a Negro child to attend the all-black school even though she lived nearer a white school.[12] The school committee's rules declared that white children were "especially entitled to enter the schools nearest to their places of residence." Black children, however, were explicitly denied access to their neighborhood school. It was thus race, not place, that regulated school attendance in Boston. After a statewide campaign organized by the father of the excluded girl, the State legislature in 1855 outlawed school segregation.

Civil War to 1950

In the South

All public school systems in the South created before the Civil War excluded black children by statute. Just after the war, the same rule continued. In 1866, Texas and Florida created school funds but excluded blacks from their benefits. The next year Kentucky did the same. Both in Florida and Kentucky, blacks were required to pay school taxes, but their children were prevented from attending the schools. They were given the option of building their own schools, in the case of Kentucky with proceeds from an additional school tax. None was built.[13]

The advent of radical reconstruction in 1867 resulted in giving blacks the vote and adoption of the 14th Amendment. Having attained formal citizenship, Negroes pried open the schools for their children. Discrimination in expenditures was forbidden. During the 1870's and early 1880's, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, more or less equality existed between black and white schools.

Numerous efforts were made to evade the new constitutional requirements. A favored way was to establish racially dual school systems, to be financed by separate taxes paid by each racial group. Black parents in Owensboro, Ky., attacked the practice in a Federal lawsuit decided in 1883. Since white parents were far wealthier than blacks, they established a school open for 9 to 10 months, while all the black parents could afford was one open for 3 months. Plaintiffs argued the disparity violated the equal protection requirement of the amendment. The Federal district court agreed. In *Claybrook v. Owensboro*, it held that "the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by this amendment must and can only mean the laws of the State must be equal in their benefit as well as in their burdens, and that less would not be 'the equal protection of the laws' ".[14] The North Carolina supreme court ruled 3 years later in *Puitt v. Commissioners* that a similar tax scheme was unconstitutional.[15]

Both *Claybrook* and *Puitt* were turned against themselves by southern States. Formal compliance was achieved when State legislatures appropriated equal amounts per child of school age. By the late 1880's, however, it had become a practice for county school boards to allocate the State aid in a racially discriminatory way among schools under their jurisdiction. By the close of the 19th century, as a result, black schools had become severely underfinanced. Protests by black parents were without avail. By that time, the Negro voter had been effectively disfranchised.

An appeal to the Supreme Court against the system of discriminatory expenditures was made by black parents in Augusta, Ga. The school board had closed a black high school while keeping a white school open. No other public high school was available to black students. The Supreme Court in *Cumming v. County Board of Education*, unanimously turned down the black parents' request, explaining:

> While all admit that the benefits and burdens of public taxation must be shared by citizens without discrimination against any class on account of their race, the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective states, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land. We have here no such case to be determined. . . [16]

Cumming assured that the *Claybrook* and *Puitt* doctrine would remain a constitutional vacuity, bereft of any concrete consequence to their purported beneficiaries. The 14th Amendment became the framework of planned educational deprivation, administered in the name of States' rights.

Segregation had gained constitutional protection 3 years earlier when, in 1896, the Supreme Court ruled in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. It approved the provision of separate-but-equal accommodations in interstate transportation as not inconsistent with the 14th Amendment. Over the preceding 30 years, a number of northern and southern State courts had applied the same doctrine in public schools. The combination of *Cumming* and *Plessy* gave immense legal force to the coexistence of segregation and planned deprivation as one fed upon the other.

Wherever large numbers of black children were concentrated in single school districts, the greatest discrimination occurred. In Mississippi during 1920-1921, for example, nearly 80 percent of the population in 19 counties was black. Black children received less than one-eighth of the school expenditure spent on white children in three counties.[17] When, in 1925, Negro parents in Covington County appealed to the Mississippi supreme court for relief, the court refused, holding:

> It is of course not necessary that every child in the county have the same advantages in the way of education that every child has . . . The operation and conduct of public schools are practical affairs. You cannot discriminate against people on account of their race or condition, but their rights may depend upon their situation, or they may be classified according to such situation and condition.[18]

Under the *Cumming* doctrine, no appeal from this ruling to the U.S. Supreme Court was possible.

The first whole legal assault on the system of segregation and planned deprivation began in the 1930's. Negro teachers entered southern courts to demand that their salaries be made equal to those of white teachers. Most courts agreed and States moved to create single salary schedules.[19] Judges tended to draw out the period of changeover while numerous school boards evaded the orders by creating "professional rating scales" to establish salaries for individual teachers. Black teachers suffered from this new discrimination but salary equalization also became more of a fact, as the following table indicates:[20]

The ratio of black to total salaries rose from 41.7 percent to 74.8 percent over the 14-year period. Such substantial court victories introduced major strains into the structure of southern schools, based as it was on allotting to white students funds that belonged to Negro students. As equal expenditures neared reality, white privilege receded.

Black parents also began to bring court challenges to the system. By the early 1950's, some 200 local cases had been filed.[21] These attacked material inequalities and requested equalization.

AVERAGE SALARY PER MEMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF, 1939-1940 to 1953-1954

	1939/1940	1949/1950	1953/1954	Percent increase 1939/1940 to 1953/1954
Negro schools	$ 601	$2,143	$2,861	376
All schools	$1,441	$3,010	$3,825	165

While only occasional parent lawsuits were successful, the impact of these few on black public opinion was considerable. In the context of the teachers' lawsuits, and the rapidly-growing movement of Negro self-organization, exemplified by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the parents' actions were exceedingly important.

In the North

During the years 1865-1950, numerous northern State courts considered cases involving the rights of Negro children to attend nonsegreated schools. While the number of court victories was considerable, few were translated into everyday school practice.

In Illinois at the end of the Civil War, black children were still excluded by law from the common schools. Under pressure by black citizens, the restriction was dropped in 1872, but no penalty was attached to continued exclusion until 1874 when the State supreme court outlawed the building of an all-black annex to an elementary school.[22] A dozen years later, however, a State appeals court permitted a school district to assign white students to otherwise unavailable white schools outside their regular area of assignment.[23] The 1874 stipulation against separate schools meant little in southern Illinois. In 1904, an historian wrote: "Colored schools exist in many places. Alton has forced its colored people into schools by themselves."[24] In Chicago during the 1920's and 1930's, teachers were employed on the basis of racial criteria. They were also assigned on the same basis.[25]

The 1947 Illinois directory of schools, issued by the State superintendent of public instruction, listed black and white schools by race, yet the existence of such schools was outlawed, presumably, in 1874. In 1947 the school board of Edwardsville, in the southern part of the State, maintained a 4-year white high school while the black high school operated only a 3-year program. When the Illinois Commission on Human Retions, a State agency, urged the State Superintendent to cut off State aid to districts which segregated schools illegally, the superintendent "replied that he had no authority to make such investigations unless the elected State's attorneys in those counties initiated suit against the elected school boards."[26] The likelihood of a States attorney in any part of Illinois taking such action was negligible at best.

School segregation in New Jersey was forbidden by State law in 1881 and by State supreme court ruling 3 years later.[27] State agencies violated both the law and ruling repeatedly over the next half-century.[28] As in Illinois, New Jersey school authorities published school statistics by race and maintained two all-black vocational schools taught only by Negroes. Black parent challenges to segregated conditions were virtually always turned down by the State. Even when school districts admitted the charge was correct, the State refused to order a change. During the 1930's, segregation spread further into the northern part of the State, again without encountering official opposition.[29] Deterioration of educational conditions was reported in the areas of growing segregation.

Throughout the North, assignment of children to specific schools was determined by a broad range of criteria. Contrary to countless recent assertions, place of residence was not one of these; at least, not for black children. Except rarely, American courts refused to recognize a claim to school assignment on the basis of residence. Almost uniformly, courts acknowledged the authority of school boards to assign students to schools. Usually, when black parents applied for an order directing a board to permit black children to attend the nearest school—often a white one—instead of a distant school—often a black one—the request was denied. As a result, Negro school children frequently went to schools which were far from their homes, hazardous to safety and health, heavily overcrowded, and inferior educationally. Blacks were not permitted the privilege of a neighborhood school.[30] This was even truer in the South.

Since 1950

In the South

In mid-1950, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund (LDF) began a frontal assault on the principle of segregation. Until then, the group had litigated for equal-although-separate schools. Five separate cases, initiated by black parents, were argued by the LDF before the Supreme Court during 1952-1955. These concerned schools in Sumerton,

S.C.; Farmville, Va.; Topeka, Kans.; Wilmington, Del.; and Washington, D.C. LDF lawyer Robert L. Carter stated the plaintiffs' principal contention:

> . . . We have been deprived of the equal protection of the laws where the statute requires appellants to attend public elementary schools on a segregated basis, because the act of segregation in and of itself denies them equal educational opportunities which the Fourteenth Amendment secures.[31]

On May 17, 1954, the Court unanimously accepted the argument and ruled:

> . . . In the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. . . We hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated. . . are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. *Brown v. Board of Education* (I), 347 U.S. 483, at 495.

The Court delayed implementation for a year, meanwhile soliciting views on the form a final order should take.

Benjamin Muse, the historian, reported that news of the *Brown* decision was received without elation in the black communities: "There was no dancing in the streets. The significance was not quickly grasped by the Negro masses. . ."[32] Very probably the reverse was nearer the mark. Two questions about *Brown* remained unanswered in 1954-55: (1) *What* action was required? and (2) *When* would the action be performed? If the Negro masses were skeptical about both questions, their sentiments were more than matched by the LDF attorneys.

In April 1955, the Supreme Court conducted a 5-day hearing on implementation. Repeatedly, LDF chief counsel Thurgood Marshall pressed the Court to set a definite timetable for desegregation. If the pace of desegregation were left to the States, Marshall declared: ". . . Then the Negro . . . would be in a horrible shape. He . . . would be as bad, if not worse off then under the 'separate but equal' doctrine . . ."[33] District court judges would be too solicitous of local school boards. "It is a national Constitution," said Marshall, "there is no place for local option in our Constitution."[34] On the last day of the hearing, he returned to the matter of a deadline, but placing it within a context of racism:

> This time limit becomes a part of the effectiveness . . . of the May 17 decision. But I don't believe any argument has ever been made to this Court to postpone the enforcement of a constitutional right. The argument is never made until Negroes are involved.[35]

Representatives of the southern States warned of widespread resistance should immediate desegregation be ordered.

In May 1955, the Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Board of Education* (II). No deadline was set. Instead, the Federal district courts were to take jurisdiction over school segregation cases. Negro children were to be admitted to public schools "as soon as practicable on a nondiscriminatory basis." School boards were directed to proceed "with all deliberate speed." *Brown II*, in the retrospective opinion of a former LDF lawyer, Robert L. Carter, was "a grave mistake" since its deliberate-speed formula set up the standard of compliance only "on terms that the white South could accept." Thus, Carter concluded, "the Warren Court sacrificed individual and immediate vindication of the newly discovered right to desegregated education . . ."[36]

Another weakness, shared by *Brown I* and *Brown II*, was the exclusive emphasis upon dismantling segregation. Historically, segregation had served as the means of planned deprivation. But this aspect of the situation was ignored in the *Brown* proceedings. School boards were not required to do anything differently than they had ever done before. Reducing or eliminating the gross material disparities between black and white schools did not form part of the order. For their own part, LDF lawyers very likely feared raising the question inasmuch as the Court might have chosen to resurrect *Plessy*, only on an equal-but-separate rather than a separate-but-equal basis. During arguments on *Brown I* southern State attorneys insisted that material equality was on the verge of being attained and thus segregation no longer exacted a special price from Negro children. LDF lawyer Spottswood Robinson replied that "even though Virginia could spend $26 millions—an enormous sum by Virginia standards—all that we succeed in doing is moving from a present 61 cents to 79 cents per Negro student for each dollar that is invested in buildings and sites for white students."[37]

Whatever the structural weaknesses of *Brown*, Negro parents seized on the decision as a chance

for an equal education. Within weeks after *Brown II* was handed down, many of these parents filed petitions with school boards, demanding entry for their children—among other places, in Orangeburg, S.C. and Yazoo City, Miss. In Virginia black parents petitioned in Newport News, Norfolk, Alexandria, Charlottesville, Arlington County, and Isle of Wight County. In each case, the petitions were rejected. Petitioners in Orangeburg and Yazoo City suffered retaliation from the white community by losing their jobs and credit; sharecroppers were evicted; and grocers refused to sell food to some.[38]

Repulsed by school boards, parents turned to the Federal district courts. Here, they lost more frequently than not.[39] In several instances, State authorities flouted Federal district court rulings favorable to desegregation; no penalty followed. From 1954 to 1960, in only 5 of 10 cases involving violence to stop a court order did Federal authorities intervene.[40] Bills were introduced in Congress during 1957 and 1960 authorizing the U.S. Department of Justice to represent black parents in desegregation cases. Both times the provision was dropped.

In the 10th school year after *Brown I*, only 34,100—i.e., 1.2 percent—of the nonborder South's 2,894,563 black children attended desegregated schools. This slender consequence of *Brown* resulted from numerous effective techniques of noncompliance adopted by southern States. Legislatures passed laws that stopped State aid from being paid to desegregated schools, closed schools under court order to desegregate, repealed compulsory attendance laws to permit white children to leave desegregrated schools, appropriated State funds to private segregated schools, and aimed at driving the NAACP from various States. In 1962, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights called pupil placement laws "the principal obstacle to desegregation in the South."[41] These measures required individual black children who wished to attend a white school to fill out special application forms, take tests (if necessary), resort to formal appeals, and the like. Meanwhile, students were to be assigned to their traditional school. In effect, these placement laws were a new form of State assignment of schools by race, the very practice outlawed by *Brown*. State and Federal courts regularly rejected black parents' challenges to placement laws. Between 1955 and 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review all cases involving such challenges.[42]

The Nation was wrenched from its constitutional slumber by the mass movement of protesting blacks, in South and North, during the early 1960's. As indicated in the previous chapter, the movement led by black students in the South set off a new explosion of peaceful energy which found its counterpart in the North. Passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 was a direct result of the movement. The new law created the basis for significant progress in the South. Two sections of the law were especially important for education. Title IV authorized the U.S. Commissioner of Education to help school districts to desegregate, and empowered the Attorney General to institute lawsuits to bring about desegregation. Title VI forbade the use of Federal funds in any federally assisted program that practiced racial discrimination. In so stipulating, Congress pledged the power of the purse to the goal of equal educational opportunity.

"This legislation," wrote Martin Luther King in 1965, "was first written in the streets."[43] Enforcement of the Civil Rights Act also began there. During the years 1965-1969, black people in the United States conducted an immense number of demonstrative actions on behalf of desegregation. (See Chapter 10 for a more detailed discussion.) Within the context of mass actions, the Federal Government felt pressed to effectuate the goals of the new law. Between 1963 and 1968, desegregation advanced further than during all the years since *Brown*.[44]

Day-to-day enforcement of title VI by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) proceeded according to a set of desegregation guidelines formulated early in 1965. While the guidelines document was vague in many respects, it was far more detailed than the text of *Brown II*. Southern Congressmen sought to weaken the guidelines or their application by budget and political threats. The administration, by 1967-1968, permitted severe weakening of HEW enforcement efforts. Between 1965 and 1969, the number of HEW personnel working directly on desegregation fell from 75 to 34. The Department of Justice filed fewer enforcement actions each year. In January, 1969, on the occasion of a change in national administration, the head of HEW's civil rights office wrote in an

PERCENTAGE OF NEGRO STUDENTS ATTENDING DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS IN SEVEN SOUTHERN STATES IN THE 1963-64 AND 1968-69 SCHOOL YEARS

	1963-1964	1968-1969
Alabama	.007	7.4
Georgia	.052	14.2
Louisiana	.602	8.8
Mississippi	.000	7.1
North Carolina	.537	27.8
South Carolina	.003	14.9
Virginia	1.630	25.7

internal memorandum that except for Justice Department lawsuits "there has been virtually no enforcement of civil rights provisions by any other [agency] of Government."[45] A general lassitude of civil rights enforcement existed at the conclusion of the Johnson administration. This tendency was accelerated under the Nixon administration.

The Civil Rights Act was important as a transition from the lagging enforcement of *Brown*. As previously stated, desegregation developed significantly after 1964. Yet, the progress was limited. Desegregation in the South made large strides only when the Supreme Court adopted a new stance towards *Brown*.

The promise of *Brown II* was evaded, as already indicated, by the pupil placement laws. These effective impediments to desegregation were succeeded in the late 1950's and mid-1960's by "free-choice" desegregation plans. Under these, students were declared "free" to select a school of their choice. Intimidation of black children, was common. U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II told Congress:

> When our fieldworkers investigate free-choice plans which are not producing school desegregation they find that in almost all instances the freedom of choice is illusory. Typically, the community atmosphere is such that Negro parents are fearful of choosing a white school for their children.[46]

Nevertheless, Federal courts regularly approved free-choice plans. They had been doing so since 1955. In that year, several weeks after *Brown II*, a three-judge Federal court in South Carolina ruled in *Briggs v. Elliott* that "the Constitution . . . does not require integration. It merely forbids segregation."[47] Thus, *Brown* II was interpreted by *Briggs* to require only that individual black students had a right to apply for transfer into white schools. *Briggs* denied any positive obligation by school districts to desegregate entire school systems. While the Supreme Court never adopted *Briggs*, a large number of lower Federal courts did so for more than a decade.

The death knell of *Briggs* was sounded by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, sitting in New Orleans. In 1966 and 1967 it ruled in *United States v. Jefferson County*. Since the Supreme Court rejected a subsequent appeal the latter year, the Fifth Circuit opinion became authoritative. "What is wrong about *Briggs*," held the aforementioned appeals court, "is that it drains out of *Brown* that decision's significance as a class action to secure equal educational opportunities for Negroes by compelling the States to reorganize their public school systems."[48] Thus, ruled the court, schools in the circuit "have the affirmative duty under the Fourteenth Amendment to bring about an integrated, unitary school system in which there are no Negro schools and no white schools—just schools."[49] While carefully drawn free-choice plans could still be used, the court set up a standard of performance by which such plans were to be evaluated: "Has the operation of the promised plan actually eliminated segregated and token-desegregated schools and achieved substantial integration?"[50]

In 1968, the Supreme Court went a step further than the Fifth Circuit in the *Green v. New Kent County* case.[51] It now ruled that "the burden on a school board today is to come forward with a

[desegregation] plan that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work *now*." Racial discrimination in the schools must be eliminated "root and branch." The high court called for "a system without a 'white' school and a 'Negro' school, but just schools." Inclusion of the word "now" in the decision was the nearest the Supreme Court had yet come to granting the NAACP LDF request of 1955 for a timetable of desegregation.

The following year, the Court ruled in *Alexander v. Holmes*, a Mississippi case.[52] It held that the "obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools." The decision was handed down on October 29, 1969; by the following January, the public schools of the State were desegregated.

Green and *Alexander* took the matter of desegregation out of the realm of formalistic compliance unaccompanied by substantial consequences. Both decisions signalled a new sense of urgency and realism by the high court. Together, they constituted a sweeping amendment of *Brown II*.

In 1971, the Supreme Court ruled in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, a landmark case that, in one respect, rivaled *Brown I* in importance: The Court now considered the implications of residential segregation for school desegregation. *Brown II* had advised district courts to seek compact attendance areas around schools to embrace all who lived nearby, black and white alike. Given the existence of segregated residence, however, compactness of school attendance areas inevitably meant those areas would be segregated. Segregated housing, the *Swann* court acknowledged, could help create segregated schools. But the reverse was also true:

> People gravitate toward school facilities, just as schools are located in response to the needs of people. The location of schools may thus influence the patterns of residential development of a metropolitan area and have important impact on composition of inner city neighborhoods.

Under such conditions effective desegregation might, the Court held, require the drawing of school attendance areas that "are neither compact nor contiguous; indeed they may be on opposite ends of the city." Since under this condition assignment to the school nearest the student's residence would not dismantle the dual system, "desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school." If mandatory student transportation were needed, school boards could employ it.

Residential segregation was thus placed under constitutional scrutiny. In urban areas—both in the North and South—*Brown I* suddenly took on an immediacy that had been lacking for the previous 17 years. Since the overwhelming majority of black children in the country lived in urban areas, under residentially segregated circumstances, the potential of *Swann* was enormous. Student transportation in such areas was the single most effective instrument in achieving desegregation. Opposition to desegregation frequently took the form of opposition to student transportation called "busing."

Student transportation at public expense had developed steadily in the half-century before *Swann*:[54]

School year	Percent of Students transported
1920-21	5.6
1931-32	9.2
1941-42	18.3
1951-52	29.0
1961-62	38.1
1969-70	42.8

In the South, transportation was organized on a racially discriminatory basis. During the mid-30's in 12 southern States, 27.3 percent of all white children enrolled were transported as compared with only 3.2 percent of the black children; Louisiana had the most disparate record (45.2 and 0.5 percent).[55] It was common to transport black children past nearby white schools. In Yancey County, N.C., during 1962, black high school students were refused entry to the nearest school and had to make an 80-mile round trip daily to a Negro school in Asheville; in mid-1964, black high school students in Havana, Ark., were bused daily for a round trip of 120 miles.[56] These practices were consistent with the general system of segregation and planned deprivation.

By 1971, the year of *Swann*, walking had become a minor means whereby students traveled to attend school in the country as a whole. That year, nearly 50 million went to school. Here is how they got there:[57]

	Number	Percent
School bus	19,030,000	38.2
Public transportation	1,514,000	3.0
Private automobile	8,140,000	16.3
Walk/bicycle	20,951,000	42.1
Other	248,000	0.4
Total	49,883,000	100.0

Curiously, not only citizen discussion but even scholarly articles assumed that student transportation was somehow abnormal. (This subject will be examined in more detail in chapter 6.) School buses had a superior safety record over either walking to school or riding in a private automobile. Compared with walking, buses were as much as six times safer; with riding in a private automobile, eight times safer.[58] Nevertheless, antibusing became a politically respectable movement in the years after *Swann*.

Green, *Alexander*, and *Swann* enabled desegregation in the South to become a practical reality rather than merely an abstract constitutional right. Between 1968 and the 1971-72 school year—the first one after *Swann*—the percentage of Negro children attending predominantly black schools in the 11-State South fell sharply from 68.0 to 9.2.[59] (The educational consequences of these changes are examined later in several chapters.)

In the North

At midcentury, no distinctive body of law had developed around the specific relationship of race and education in the North. The long history of official and unofficial State action on behalf of racial discrimination in northern schools remained unwritten; perhaps even forgotten. However, the Supreme Court in *Brown I* referred to the abolition of segregation in the public schools of Boston, it also observing:

> ...ut elsewhere in the North segregation in public education has persisted in some communities until recent years. It is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern.[60]

The following year, in *Brown II*, the Court decreed: "All provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring or permitting such [racial] discrimination [in public education] must yield . . ." By 1955, in no northern State was there a statutory basis to school segregation. The last such law—in Indiana—had been repealed 5 years earlier.

Black parents in the North had been suing school boards for more than a century. Almost always they complained of overt discrimination against their children. These acts ranged from outright exclusion, to segregation in separate quarters or within the common school building, to inequitable financial requirements. Courts were generally inhospitable to appeals for redress, but occasional parent victories occurred. No such case was ever considered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

During the decade after *Brown*, northern school boards and their attorneys formulated a legal doctrine which in effect was to relieve them of accountability for school segregation. This doctrine asserted a sharp distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation; the former was caused by affirmative statutory authority, the latter was a happenstance consequence of residential segregation. The one was conscious and designed while the other was neutral and impersonal. Clearly, the intent was to identify *de jure* segregation with the pre-*Brown* South and *de facto* segregation with the North.

Historically, the *de facto* doctrine was weak. Deliberate segregative action by northern public officials was widespread. Even in northern States with a history of segregation laws—such as Indiana and Missouri—legislation brought no changes in the pattern of assignment of students. On the other hand, the comparative rarity of segregation laws in the North lent plausibility to the argument. In the absence of declared public commitment to segregation by school boards, potential plaintiffs were faced by an immense job of gathering facts if and when they would opt to file suit. Another possible avenue was to attack the racial concentration itself, without regard to how it arose.

Under *Plessy*, separation was constitutionally valid unless it were accompanied by unequal facilities. That the availability of equal facilities under segregation was a myth both in the North and South did not prevent courts from ignoring the obvious. Separation as such was unobjectionable under the *Plessy* doctrine.

Before 1954, apparently only three cases concerning segregation as such came before State courts, two in New York and one in Indiana. In 1900, black plaintiffs in Queens, New York City charged discrimination in that their children were

assigned to a single school. The court rejected the claim, holding "it is equal school facilities and accommodations that are required to be furnished and not equal social opportunities."[61] In 1943, the New York State Commissioner of Education closed an illegal all-black school in Ramapo because it was patently inferior to the white school. He stressed, however, that "if the [attendance] lines are reasonably drawn the fact that most or all the school children are of one race or another race does not render the zoning illegal."[62] In 1926, when Indianapolis authorities announced they were going to build a high school, black parents sued to force the choice of another site. They contended that since the announced site was in the midst of a Negro area of residence, the new school would almost certainly be all-black. The court rejected this argument and ruled: "In the absence of fraud, the court will not interpose and impose upon school authorities the judgment of the court concerning matters committed by law to the discretion of school authorities."[63]

All three cases involved intentional policies of separation by school authorities. In New York in 1900 and Indiana in 1926, deliberate segregation was allowed by law. By 1943, New York law no longer permitted segregation. Yet, the board of education had continued to practice it. None of the three cases exemplifies *de facto* segregation since in none of them was segregation fortuitous or unplanned.

The advent of *Brown* left the legal situation in the North unaffected, at best. In 1956, the New York State Commissioner of Education ruled that citizens of Babylon were unjustified in challenging the existence of a predominantly minority school. He held: "Because of the incidence of location, the mere fact that the preponderance of the children who would normally attend the neighborhood school happened to be white or Negro, of Polish, Irish, Scotch, Swedish, Italian or English descent or otherwise . . . does not require a board to attempt to gerrymander the [attendance] lines, to assign but a certain percentage to a particular school."[64] Both in Kansas and South Carolina, Federal courts explicitly approved the existence of one-race schools. In the former case the court held:

> Desegregation does not mean that there must be intermingling of the races in all school districts . . . If . . . the [school attendance] district is inhabited entirely by colored students, no violation of any constitutional right results because they are compelled to attend the school in the district in which they live.

(Ironically, this ruling was the last one made by a Federal court in the original *Brown* case.) *Briggs* drew the same conclusion.

Racial concentration in the absence of legal mandate was thus as constitutional under *Brown* as under *Plessy*. Black experience in the United States, however, embraced more than segregation in the schools. It also included, inevitably, inferior facilities and lesser educational opportunities. During the arguments on *Brown* before the Supreme Court in 1953-1954, segregation—not deprivation—was made the issue. Having ruled against the first, the Court ignored the second. But, clearly, the condition continued to exist. Was deprivation of black children therefore constitutional? Or, was it unconstitutional only if deliberate? If so, did black parents have any recourse where evidence of intent was unavailable?

One reply emerged in 1957 when the Virginia supreme court in *Dobbins v. Commonwealth* ordered an all-white high school in West Point to accept a black applicant rather than force her to attend an inferior black high school. Her father had refused to send her to the latter school and kept her home. The State board of education charged him with violation of the compulsory attendance law. This action was struck down by the State high court which ruled that "application of a criminal statute so that it brings about or results in inequality of treatment to the two races is not justified."[66]

The potential significance of *Dobbins* became clearer the next year when a magistrate in a New York City family court ruled boldly that black parents who withheld their children from attendance in all-black schools on the ground that these were inferior were not neglecting their children's education.[67] Justice Justine Wise Polier characterized the all-black schools as inferior because they were segregated and staffed with teachers who were not as qualified as those in predominantly white schools elsewhere in the city. With both parties doubtful of the future course of an appeal, an out-of-court settlement was reached; it applied only to the case at hand. The larger issue was laid aside.[68]

Litigation in the North during the 1960's was controlled largely by the *Briggs* doctrine as

mediated through *Bell v. School Board* (involving Gary, Ind.) and *Downs v. Board of Education* (involving Kansas City, Mo.). In both, concentrations of black students were approved since they had resulted presumably from assignment to schools by residence, not race.[69] Unless plaintiffs could prove that school boards had engaged in overt discrimination, the existing segregation was explained as a simple reflection of residential segregation—thus not the boards' doing. This was the concept of *de facto* segregation.

Critics of the doctrine rejected the concept of a neutral school board, and pointed out that board action was State action, thus implicating school authorities in violations of equal protection.[70] More salient for change than scholarship in this area, however, was political pressure arising from the civil rights movement. In New York State, the Board of Regents in 1960 adopted a policy of desegregation. Courts upheld efforts of school boards to comply voluntarily. They ruled that such plans, based as they must be in part on racial considerations, were not attempts to discriminate. In New Jersey, the State supreme court went further in *Booker v. Board of Education*—involving Plainfield—and held that the State was obliged to correct "substantial racial imbalance which may be educationally harmful though it has not reached the standard of 'all or nearly all Negro'."[71] Massachusetts in 1965 passed the Racial Imbalance Act which required school boards to desegregate once a school had a predominantly black enrollment. In 1963, Illinois had passed the Armstrong Act, aimed at eliminating segregation by revising attendance area boundaries.

The *de facto* doctrine was severely weakened by these changes for they contradicted the formula: "we do not need to correct what we did not cause." Since *Brown*, deliberate segregation has been illegal. Now, so-called nondeliberate segregation began to lose its legal protection in several States.

Oddly enough, the most serious blow to the *de facto* doctrine came from court decisions which found school districts guilty of *de jure* segregation. Between 1961 and 1972, as the table on page 12 indicates, Federal district courts outside the South found nine school boards violating the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment:

Since this compilation was drawn up, similar findings were made by Federal courts with respect to Indianapolis, Detroit, Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Dayton, Minneapolis, Braddock, Pa., and Kinloch, Mo. In addition, during the same recent period, State courts ruled similarly in two Illinois cities (Waukegan and Madison) and three California cities (Los Angeles, Inglewood, and Richmond). Administrative action against northern school boards has occurred in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts and, on a Federal level, by limited proceedings of the Office for Civil Rights in HEW.

In 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Keyes v. School District*, its first "northern" case. It accepted evidence from a lower court that Denver school authorities had deliberately segregated part of the city's schools. Teachers had been assigned by race and students channeled to certain schools. "... A finding of intentionally segregative school board actions in a meaningful portion of a school system, as in this case," held the Supreme Court, "creates a presumption that other segregated schooling within the system is not adventitious."[72] The burden of proof, therefore, lay upon the school board to demonstrate that its action elsewhere in the school system were untainted by intention to segregate. Later in the year, the lower court, following Supreme Court instructions, held a new hearing and found that the entire school system of Denver was unconstitutionally segregated.[73]

By the mid-1970's, the principal judicial supports of *de facto* doctrine had been removed. In 1968, in *Green*, the Supreme Court rejected the *Briggs* rule that there was no affirmative obligation to desegregate. Five years later, the Court laid that obligation upon a northern school district, even in the absence of either a State segregation law or direct courtroom testimony attesting to district-wide discriminatory acts by the school board. State legislation requiring affirmative desegregation action spread during the late 60's and early 70's. A series of important State supreme court decisions in 1971-1972 added to the movement away from *de facto* doctrine.[74] Many of these legal steps still lacked full implementation.

Meanwhile, in judicial terms, northern desegregation in 1975 was roughly where southern desegregation had been 10 years before. Aside from school districts found violating the Fourteenth Amendment, there existed no general obligation by school districts to desegregate entire school

Types of Discrimination Found By Federal District Courts In Northern Desegregation Cases, 1961-1972*

Type of discrimination found by the court	Denver, Colo.	Las Vegas, Nev.	Manhassett, N.Y.	New Rochelle, N.Y.	Oxnard, Calif.	Pasadena, Calif.	Pontiac, Mich.	San Francisco, Calif.	South Holland, Ill.
1. Discriminatory drawing or alterations of attendance zones	X		X	X		X	X	X	X
2. Discriminatory location of new schools	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
3. Discriminatory expansion of existing schools (e.g., enlarging minority schools rather than transferring minority students to nearby white schools with space available)	X	X			X	X		X	
4. School board's failure to relieve overcrowding at white schools by transferring white students to nearby minority schools where space was available	X								X
5. Discriminatory hiring of teachers and administrators	X					X	X		X
6. Discriminatory assignment of teachers and administrators	X	X				X	X	X	X
7. Discriminatory promotion of teachers and administrators						X			
8. School board's perpetuation or exacerbation of segregation in schools by its strict adherence to neighborhood school policy after segregated school system had developed		X	X	X		X			
9. School board's failure to adopt a proposed integration plan, or to implement previously adopted plans	X				X				
10. School board's adoption of "open enrollment" or "free transfer" policies having the effect of allowing whites to transfer out of black schools without producing a significant movement of blacks to white schools or whites to black schools				X	X	X			

*Testimony of William L. Taylor in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing, Hearings* . . . . , Part 3 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office 1972), p. 1682.

systems. Instead, school boards were employing numerous renovated free-choice arrangements, called open enrollment, magnet schools, voluntary desegregation, and other names. These constitute an effort by boards to interpret *Brown* as simply expanding educational alternatives for single children rather than eliminating dual systems of educational opportunity.

In the North as a whole, by fall, 1970 slightly over one-fourth (27.7 percent) of all black pupils attended predominantly white schools. In the South, this proportion had risen sharply over the preceding 2 years from 18.4 to 38.1 percent.[75] Around the turn of the decade, the northern cities that desegregated did so under court order or administrative decree. Few desegregated voluntarily. (Nor, of course, had many southern districts done so.) The crucial difference between contemporary desegregation in the North and South lies in the role of the Supreme Court. Should it continue to extend its guidance to northern school districts, a considerable change will undoubtedly occur. In the absence of such action, pressure will build to adopt a national legislative policy of desegregation applicable equally to North and South. Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment could provide the legal framework for such a step.[76]

Unequal expenditures for black and white students have been an historic feature of dual schooling, both in the North and South. *Brown* did not deal with this problem. While the racial expenditure gap narrowed after *Brown*, it by no means disappeared. Researchers found it more difficult to ascertain the precise dimensions of the gap as publication of racial breakdown of expenditures virtually ceased. In addition, few if any school districts published an accounting of actual per school and per child expenditures; at best, only budgeted or authorized expenditure data were available. Further, much of the information was districtwide; per school data were simply averaged out.

The problem of a black-white gap has been submerged, if not assimilated, into another problem—i.e., unequal per student expenditures that vary between taxing units within single States. A single remedy, abolishing or modifying the property tax or altering its administration, has monopolized the attention of reformers. The master assumption seems to be that the black-white gap is a lesser inequity than the interdistrict disparities; and that the more school financing approaches a statewide basis, the more equitable the entire system will become.

This faith finds only modest historical support. The development of State responsibility for the common schools did, of course, greatly increase educational opportunities. For minority children, however, this was less true. In 1926, Bond, after a close study of black education in Oklahoma, observed that the Negro schools "are going to remain below par just as long as the county remains the unit of financial support."[77] On the other hand, historian Louis R. Harlan, after an analysis of black schooling in the Southeast from 1901 to 1915, concluded: "Simply enlarging the unit of taxation was not a solution of the inequities of southern school finance, even for whites."[78]

Virtually no researcher has tried to measure systematically school-by-school intradistrict inequalities that relate to race and class. In New York City and Chicago, recent (early 1970's) analyses indicated the existence of such inequality.[79] Repeated instances of similar character were widely reported by white teachers in the South assigned to newly desegregated, formerly all-black schools. Extensive audits of school district expenditures by the HEW audit agency concluded that significant sums of money appropriated for "educationally deprived" children had not been used for this purpose.

The case for property tax reform to equalize interdistrict inequalities has its own justification. But it is separate from the problem of intradistrict inequalities. Until, in the words of *Green*, all schools are "just schools", without stigmas of race and class, it is idle to imagine that they can be financed as though they *were* "just schools."

HIGHER EDUCATION

Southern States used Morrill Act funds as reported in the previous chapter exclusively to set up white land grant colleges. Although the size of the land-grant for colleges was dependent ultimately on the size of population, including blacks, the latter were excluded from the law's benefits. Friends of the freedmen complained to Congress of this discrimination. They were on the verge of victory in 1866 when a House of Representatives committee sponsored an amendment to the Morrill Act: "That ... no person shall be excluded on account of race or color from the benefits of the

school or educational fund arising from the lands thus donated."[80] The provision was dropped after unfavorable discussion on the floor of the House.

In 1890, a second Morrill Act was passed. This one provided that no State could receive grants unless the proceeds were "equitably divided" among the races. Enforcement powers were lodged with the Secretary of the Interior. During the first decade of the law, the Secretary suspended funds to South Carolina in order to force the State to increase appropriations for its black land grant college. An appeal to Congress restored the cut. Apparently, the Secretary of the Interior never tried again.[81]

In effect, the failure of enforcement of the Morrill Act produced in higher education the same situation created in 1899 by *Cumming*. The States were left free from Federal regulation to do almost as they wished with black education. In Texas, the constitution of 1876 pledged to establish a State university for blacks "when practicable." Seventy years later the pledge was still unredeemed. In 1921, a Missouri law created the Board of Curators for Lincoln University and directed it "to afford the Negro people of the State opportunity for training up to the standard furnished at the State University of Missouri whenever necessary and practicable in their opinion."[82] No action was ever taken by the curators.

Excluded without exception from southern State universities, Negroes wishing to enroll as graduate students began turning to the courts in 1933. Two years later, Donald Murray, a graduate of Amherst College, sued successfully to gain entrance to the University of Maryland.[83] Amid celebrations in black communities, NAACP chief counsel Charles H. Houston predicted that "the other southern State universities are not going to confess error just because Murray obtained a favorable decision in Maryland."[84] Houston proved correct. Southern universities forced each black applicant to sue separately. Every action was based on the ground of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. In turn, the universities usually referred applicants to the Negro land grant college in the State.

In 1936, Lloyd Gaines, a Negro, applied to enter the law school of the University of Missouri. He was rejected and advised either to request the black college, Lincoln University, to initiate a law course or to apply for an out-of-State scholarship. Gaines sued, and lost; the State supreme court upheld the decision. Gaines appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court which, in 1938, decided in his favor.[85] "The basic consideration," held the Court, "is ... what opportunities Missouri ... furnishes to white students and denies to Negroes solely upon the ground of color." Rejected was the option of out-of-State tuition. The Court explained that equal opportunity must be offered within the State's own boundaries. To avoid desegregating the State university, Missouri legislators, the next year, increased appropriations to all-black Lincoln University, and, overnight, courses and professional schools parallel with those at the University of Missouri were to be offered.

Gaines was an effort to stress the equality of separate-but-equal. It rejected separation with differential quality offerings. Southern States, however, evaded the new emphasis on equal facilities. And they minimized the desegregative impact of the decision. Four devices were employed. The first was the out-of-State scholarship with dollar value almost always less than the average State expenditure per student at white State universities. Second, was the regional association of southern States which permitted blacks from one State to attend an institution in an associated State. This perpetuated segregation inasmuch as all out-of-State Negro medical students, for example, were sent to virtually all-black Meharry Medical College in Nashville. White students benefited more because they had a wider interstate choice. Increasing appropriations to black State colleges was a third evasive device. Between 1938-39 and 1947-48, the per student expenditure for black land-grant colleges as compared with that for whites rose from 62.5 percent to 90.4 percent.[86] Unfortunately, none of the historic disparity that was so sizable by the 1930's was overcome even by the latter percentage since parity had not been achieved. Forcing each black applicant to litigate on his or her own behalf ensured a pattern of tokenism enforced later by the common schools.

Following *Brown II*, indications seemed firm that public higher education in the South would soon be desegregated. During 1955-56, Negroes in Texas won four court decisions based on *Brown* that opened all-white colleges to them.[87] In 1955, a Federal district court in North Carolina ruled that *Brown* applied to higher education; this decision was affirmed the next year by the Supreme Court.[88] In 1956 public colleges and

universities in Tennessee were ordered to desegregate.[89] Neither in North Carolina nor Tennessee, however, did desegregation ensue. Segregated public higher education became a privileged enclave beyond the effective reach of the new constitutional doctrine.[90]

In 1968 segregated public higher education once more became an issue when Tennessee State officials were directed by a Federal district judge to desegregate the State's public colleges and universities. A 6-year delay followed before the court held hearings on specific plans. Meanwhile, the court action rekindled interest among Federal officials. At the same time, the Office for Civil Rights of HEW began notifying institutions that their Federal grants were being endangered by persistent segregation. In 1969-70, 10 States were directed to submit desegregation plans. Five States ignored the directive while the other five submitted unacceptable plans. OCR failed for as long as 3 years to make any formal determination of noncompliance. Federal funds continued to be awarded to and spent by the 10 States. A lawsuit was then filed against HEW and OCR to compel them to administer title VI in accordance with their own administrative regulations. Late in 1972, the suit was decided against the Government, in *Adams v. Richardson*.[91] Numerous postponements were granted the States as they sought approval of various plans. Suit was filed by the U.S. Department of Justice against Louisiana when it refused to submit a plan.[92]

Beginning in the late 1960's OCR began to enforce Federal Executive Order 11246, which forbade discrimination by any contractor with the Federal Government on account of race, color, nationality, or sex. Contractors were directed to formulate a plan for affirmative action to overcome existing disparities. Colleges and universities, many of them Government contractors, sought to fulfill the requirement.

It should be recalled, as described in the previous chapter, that American higher education as a whole had practiced systematic exclusion of black faculty for many years. Numerous qualified black academicians, who later become outstanding authorities in their field of research, were rejected from employment solely on the ground of race. A firm 100-0 quota had been enforced rigidly. Only in the past generation has this begun to change. The first 4 years of the OCR program brought exceedingly minor changes in colleges and universities. According to a study by the American Council of Education, the percentage of blacks on college faculties rose from 2.2 percent in 1968-69 to 2.9 per cent in 1972-73.[93]

By the mid-1970's, the constitutional law of higher educational opportunity could hardly be said to exist. In some respects it rested at the level of *Plessy*. Many of the measures offered to remedy segregation have turned out to be essentially steps to make predominantly black colleges "more equal." Others have consisted of proposals to increase the number of white students at the black colleges. Such actions resemble the state of desegregation judicial doctrine around 1958 and might be called "early *Brown*." Absent thus far are concrete plans for—or detailed judicial orders to create—unitary systems of public higher education. This stage might be called "late *Brown*" or "early *Green*."

FOOTNOTES

[1]See Roy Wilkins in Charles L. Sanders, "A Frank Interview With Roy Wilkins," *Ebony*, 29 (April 1974), p. 38: "At one time, the U.S. Supreme Court was actually considered as our enemy."

[2]See, for example, Frank J. Klingberg, *The Appraisal of the Negro in Colonial South Carolina. A Study in Americanization* (Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers, 1941), p. 105; Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, pp. 160-161; and John Hope Franklin, *The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790-1860* (New York: Russell and Russell, repr. 1969), p. 168.

[3]See, for example, John H. Russell, *The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1865* (Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins Press, 1913), p. 145.

[4]Robert H. Bremner and others (eds.), *Children and Youth in America. A Documentary History. I: 1600-1865* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 316-317.

[5]See Charles T. Hickock, *The Negro in Ohio, 1802-1870* (Cleveland, Ohio: Williams Publ. and Electric Co., 1896), p. 81 and U.S. Commissioner of Education, *Legal Status of the Colored Population in Respect to Schools and Education in the Different States*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1871), p. 343 (hereinafter cited as *Legal Status of the Colored Population in Respect to Schools and Education in the Different States*).

[6]See Bremner and others (eds.), *Children and Youth in America*, I, p. 438.

[7]*Chalmers v. Stewart*, 11 Ohio 386 (1842).

[8]*Lewis v. Henley*, 2 Ind. 334-335 (1850).

[9]*Jeffries v. Ankeny*, 11 Ohio 372 (1842).

[10]*Van Camp v. Board of Education of Logan*, 9 Ohio St. 415 (1859).

[11]See Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1970), pp. 286-287; Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, p. 335; *see Clark v. The Board of Directors*, 24 Iowa 272-273 (1868).

[12]*Roberts v. Boston*, 59 Mass. (5 Cush.) 210 (1849).

[13]See Lawrence D. Rice, *The Negro in Texas, 1874-1900* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1971), pp. 212-213; John Hope Franklin, "Jim Crow Goes to School: The Genesis of Legal Separation in the South," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 58 (Spring 1959), reprinted in Charles E. Wynes (ed.), *The Negro in the South Since 1865* (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1965), p. 140; and U.S. Commissioner of Education, *Legal Status of the Colored Population in Respect to Schools and Education in the Different States*, p. 347.

[14]*Claybrook v. Owensboro*, 16 Fed. R. 302 (1883).

[15]*Puitt v. Commissioners*, 94 N.C. 519 (1886).

[16]*Cumming v. County Board of Education*, 175 U.S. 545 (1899).

[17]Data in W.E.B. DuBois, "The Negro Common School, Mississippi," *Crisis*, (December 1926)

[18]*Bryant et al. v. Barnes, Tax Collector*, 106 So. 116 (1925).

[19]The fullest account of the movement can be found in Butler A. Jones, *Law and Social Change: A Study of the Impact of New Legal Requirements Affecting Equality of Educational Opportunities for Negroes Upon Certain Customary Official Behavior in the South, 1938-1955* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1955).

[20]Data in Welch, "Black-White Differences in Returns to Schooling," p. 900.

[21] Jones, *Law and Social Change*, p. 463.

[22]*Chase v. Stephenson*, 71 Ill. 383 (1874).

[23]*People v. McFall*, 26 Ill. App. 319 (1886).

[24]N. Dwight Harris, *The History of Negro Servitude in Illinois and of the Agitation in That State* (Chicago, Ill.: McClurg, 1904), p. 242.

[25]Mary J. Herrick, *Negro Employees of the Chicago Board of Education* (Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1931), pp. 12-13 and *passim*.

[26]Mary J. Herrick, *The Chicago Schools*, manuscript copy, quoted in *Integrated Education*, 9 (September-October 1971), p. 58.

[27]*Pierce v. Union District School Trustees*, 46 N.J. 26 (1884).

[28]See Meyer Weinberg, *Race and Place: A Legal History of the Neighborhood School* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 72-73.

[29]See New Jersey State Temporary Commission on the Condition of the Urban Colored Population, *Report ... to the Legislature of the State of New Jersey ... 1939* (Trenton, N.J.: The Legislature, 1939), pp. 39-42.

[30]See Weinberg, *Race and Place*, *passim*.

[31]Leon Friedman (ed.), *Argument: The Oral Argument Before the Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1952-55* (New York: Chelsea House, 1969), p. 12.

[32]Benjamin Muse, *Ten Years of Prelude. The Story of Integration Since the Supreme Court's 1954 Decision* (New York: Viking, 1964), p. 19.

[33]Friedman, *Argument*, p. 400.

[34]*Ibid.*, p 400.

[35]*Ibid.*, pp. 524-525.

[36]Robert L. Carter, "The Warren Court and Desegregation," *Michigan Law Review*, 67 (1968-1969), p. 243.

[37]Friedman, *Argument*, p. 104

[38]See Muse, *Ten Years of Prelude*, pp. 82-83; Robbin L. Gates, *The Making of Massive Resistance. Virginia's Politics of Public School Desegregation, 1954-1956* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1964), p. 56; and Willie Morris, *Yazoo. Integration in a Deep Southern Town* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 17.

[39]Jack W. Peltason, *Fifty-Eight Lonely Men. Southern Federal Judges and School Desegregation* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961). p. 100.

[40]*Ibid.*, p. 51.

[41]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Civil Rights U.S.A. Public Schools Southern States 1962* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 4.

[42]Carter, "The Warren Court and Desegregation," p. 244.

[43]Martin Luther King, "Let Justice Roll Down," *Nation*, March 15, 1965, pp. 271-272.

[44]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Federal Enforcement of School Desegregation* (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, September 11, 1969), p. 31.

[45]Mrs. Ruby G. Martin to John Veneman, January 31, 1969, in Barney Sellers, "Appendix Background Material," p. 1-65 in A. Philip Randolph Institute, *The Reluctant Guardians. A Survey of Federal Civil Rights Laws*, PB 192 346 (Springfield, Va.: Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, December 1969).

[46]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Southern School Desegregation 1966-'67* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967) p. 31.

[47]*Briggs v. Elliott*, 132 F. Supp. 777 (1955).

[48]*U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, 372 F 2d (1966).

[49]*U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, 380 F 2d (1967). Cert. denied 389 U.S. 840 (1967).

[50]*U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, 372 F 2d (1966).

[51]*Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

[52]*Alexander v. Homes*, 396 U.S. 19 (1969).

[53]*Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

[54]Paul V. Smith, "Pupil Transportation: A Brief History," *Inequality in Education*, No. 11 (March 1972), p. 16.

[55]*Ibid.*, p. 18.

[56]U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Public Schools. Southern States 1962*, pp. 97-98 and U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *1964 Staff Report on Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 47.

[57]Data in U.S. Department of Transportation, School Bus Task Force, *Pupil Transportation Safety Program Plan* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 1973), p. 3.

[58]See *ibid.*, p. 5 and Weinberg, *Race and Place*, p. 25.

[59]*Adams v. Richardson*, 480 F.2d, 1159.

[60]*Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294, 491 N.6.

[61]*People ex rel. Cisco v. School Board*, 161 N.Y. 598, 600 (1900).

[62]*Matter of Central School District No. 1, Town of Ramapo*, 65 [New York] State Dept. Rep. 107 (1943).

[63]*Greathouse v. Board of School Commissioners of City of Indianapolis*, 198 Ind. 95, 101 (1926).

[64]*Matter of Alyce Bell*, 77 [New York] State Dept. Rep. 38 (1956).

[65]*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 199 F. Supp. 470 (1955).

[66]*Dobbins v. Commonwealth*, 198 Va. 697, 96 S.E. 2d 157 (1957).

[67]*In re Skipwith*, 180 NYS 2d 852, 46 R.R.L.R.264 (1958).

[68]See Weinberg, *Race and Place*, p. 57.

[69]*Bell v. School Board of the City of Gary, Indiana*, 324 F. 2d 209 (1963) and *Downs v. Board of Education of Kansas City*, 336 F 2d 988 (1964).

[70]See John Kaplan, "Segregation Litigation and the Schools–Part III: The Gary Litigation," *Northwestern University Law Review*, (May-June 1964); Owen M. Fiss, "Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools: The Constitutional Concepts," *Harvard Law Review*, (January 1965); and Meyer Weinberg, "De Facto Segregation: Fact or Artifact?" *Integrated Education*, 1 (April 1963), pp. 30-33.

[71]*Booker v. Board of Education of Plainfield*, 45 N.J. 181 (1965).

[72]*Keyes v. School District No. 1*, 413 U.S. 189 (1973).

[73]*Integrated Education*, 12 (January-April 1974), p. 14.

[74]See *Integrated Education*: March-April 1971, pp. 35-39 (California); May-June 1972, pp. 70-74 (Washington), and July-August 1972, pp. 47-54 (Pennsylvania).

[75]*Integrated Education*, 9 (March-April 1972), p. 40.

[76]Section 5 reads: "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." See Owen Fiss, "The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Case and Its Significance for Northern School Desegregation," *University of Chicago Law Review*, 38 (Summer 1971).

[77]Horace Mann Bond, "The Negro Common School in Oklahoma," *Crisis, (July 1928), p. 245.*

[78]Louis R. Harlan, *Separate and Unequal Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1901-1915* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), p. 210.

[79]Jacob Landers, "Profiles of Inequality in New York City," *Integrated Education*, 11 (January-February 1973), p. 3-14 and Richard A. Berk and Alice Hartmann, "Race and School Funds in Chicago, 1971," *Integrated Education*, 10 (January-February 1972), pp. 52-57.

[80]George N. Rainsford, *Congress and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century* (Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1972), p. 99.

[81]Gary Orfield, *The Reconstruction of Southern Education. The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act* (New York: Wiley, 1969), p. 8.

[82]Robert M. Sawyer, *The Gaines Case: Its Background and Influence on the University of Missouri and Lincoln University 1936-1950* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1966), p. 161.

[83]*University of Maryland v. Donald T. Murray*, 169 Md. 478 (1936).

[84]Charles H. Houston, "Don't Shout Too Soon," *Crisis*, 43 (March 1936) p. 91.

[85]*Gaines v. Canada*, 305 U.S. 337 (1938).

[86]See data in James A. Colston, *State Financial Support of Higher Education in Georgia from 1932 to 1949 with Specific Reference to Higher Education for the Negro* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958), p. 118. These data cover 11 southeastern States.

[87]Jessie P. Guzman, *Twenty Years of Court Decisions Affecting Higher Education in the South, 1938-1958* (Tuskegee, Ala.: Tuskegee Institute, 1960), p. 22.

[88] *Frasier v. Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina*, 134 F. Supp. 589, aff'd, 350 U.S. 979 (1956).

[89] *Booker v. Tennessee Board of Higher Education*, 240 F. 2d 689 (1957), *cert. den.*, 353 U.S. 965 (1957). See also, Jack Greenberg, *Race Relations and American Law* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 260-267.

[90] See Reed Sarratt, *The Ordeal of Desegregation. The First Decade* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), chapter 5.

[91] *Adams v. Richardson*, 480 F 2d. 1159.

[92] For political background on the issue of desegregation of higher education in Louisiana, see Leon E. Panetta and Peter Gall, *Bring Us Together. The Nixon Team and The Civil Rights Retreat* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Lippincott, 1971), pp. 330-331.

[93] *Integrated Education*, 11 (July-October 1973), p. 11.